10 f e

A Second ADMONITION TO THE Diſſenting Inhabitants Of the Dioceſs of DERRY,

Concerning Mr. *J. Boyſe* his Vindication of his *Remarks* on a Diſcourſe,

CONCERNING

The Inventions of Men IN THE VVorſhip of GOD.

K

By William, Lord Biſhop of Derry.

King
Given me by ye Rt Author. Oct: 31. 1695 W Molyneux

DUBLIN,
Printed by *Andrew Crook*, Printer to the King's Moſt *Excellent* Majeſty. 1695.

U. 9

ERRATA.

PAge 6 *l.* 2, add in the Margin, [*Mr.* Craighead *proves the kneeling at the Sacrament a breach of the Second Commandment p.* 113 *becauſe* The Signs have Coadoration with Chriſt, partaking of the ſame Worſhip. *And p.* 143, The Second Commandment ſtands in our way, diſcharging Religious Worſhip deſignedly before any Creature.] *p.* 7 *l.* 2 *for* of *read* if, *ib. l.* 15 *read* Donaghmore, *p.* 8 *l.* 18 *for* Wolſon *read* Wilſon, *p.* 10 *l.* 14 *for* one *read* two, *ib. l.* 20 *read* ſigned, *p.* 11 *l.* 29 *for* 2400 *read* 1600, *p.* 12 *l.* 23 *for* 600 *read* 6000, *p.* 13 *l.* 32 *after* adminiſtred *in, add* ——— *p.* 14 *l.* 31 *for* your *read* their, *p.* 15 *l.* 6 *before* the year *read* in, *p.* 16 *l.* 16 *read* diſperſion, *ib. l.* 18 *for* 1688 *read* 1689, *p.* 18 *l.* 24 *for* Rowal *read* Rowat, *p.* 20 *l.* 7 *before* one *read* in, *ib.* 34 *for* whold *read* whole, *p.* 27 *l.* 17 *in the margin for* by a *read* with an, *p.* 29 *l.* 20 *read* Concluſion, *p.* 30. *Sect. IX. l.* 1. *for* Seventhly *read* Sixthly, *and ſo on in the beginning of each Sect. to Sect.* 13, *Set the number backward by one. p.* 37 *l.* 4 *read* Laughing, *p.* 38 *l.* 31 *for* 1683 *read* 1638, *p.* 42 *l.* 10 *for* Quire *read* Choire, *p.* 43 *l.* 1 *for* Secondly *read* Thirdly, *p.* 44 *l.* 11 *after Congregation* a comma, *p.* 47 *l.* 2 *read* contrary, *p.* 53 *l.* 4 *for* Care *read* Cure, *p.* 55 *l.* 22 *read* Apoſtatas, *ib. l.* 27 *read* Conviction, *p.* * 53 *l.* 28 *for* in which *read* In the laſt, *with a full point after* Remarks, *ibid l.* 29 *dele* and, *p.* * 54 *l.* 3 *after* it *read* now, *ibid l.* 4 *dele* now, *ibid l.* 16 *after* Clauſe *a Semicolon, ibid l.* 25 *for* and *read* as it, *p.* * 55 *marginal note l.* 3 *for* Commanded *read* Required, *p.* * 56 *l.* 25 *after* one *read* or two, *ibid l.* 27 *after* Pariſh *cloſe the parentheſis, after* it *dele parentheſis, ibid l.* 28 *dele* for *p.* 57 *l.* 13 *after* abuſed *a Semicolon, p.* 58 *l.* 21 *after* generally *read* that, *p.* 60 *l.* 23 *for* where you are moſt numerous *read* of which you are the greateſt part, *p.* 61 *l.* 13 *before* Laſtly *add* IV. *ibid l.* 24 *for* IV. *read* V, *p.* 62 *l.* 12 *for* your Miniſters *read* them, *ibid l.* 20 *and* 21 *read* deciſive, *p.* 63 *l.* 17 *after* four *read* of your Communicants to be thus devout and ſerious, *p.* 70 *l.* 5 *for* for *read* to, *p.* 71 *l. penult. before* Book *read* my.

APPENDIX.

Page 4 *l.* 4 *for* it's *read* Baptiſms, *ibid l.* 6 *from the bottom for* nor *r.* not, *p.* 10 *l.* 14 *after* them *r.* as, *p.* 11 *l.* 30 *after* that *r.* it, *p.* 13 *l.* 6 *from the bottom, before* it *read* that, *p.* 16 *l.* 7 *read* Maſter and Law-giver, *ibid l.* 29 *for* proteſt *read* protect, *p.* 17 *l. laſt dele* to, *p.* 27 *l.* 16 *read* them

ERRATA.

them, *p.* 30 *l.* 5 *read* Evangelicus, *ibid l.* 13 *read* Rending, *p.* 38 *l.* 20 *dele* a, *ibid l.* 24 *after* beſides *dele the ſtop*, *p.* 39 *l.* 1 *for* IV. *read* VI, *ibid l.* 16 *and* 19 *for* 1693 *read* 1641, *ibid l.* 4 *from the bottom dele* and, *p.* 44 *l. penult. after* of *read* external, *p.* 48 *l.* 14 *after* ſhall *read* firſt, *ibid l.* 15 *after* and *read* then, *p.* 49 *l.* 4 *read* unlawful, *p.* 50 *l.* 19 *read* Covenant, *p.* 54 *l.* 28 *for* its *read* it, *p.* 56 *l* 3 *from the bottom*, *for* theſe *read* thoſe.

Heads of the Diſcourſe.

CHAP. I.

Matters of Fact.

Sect. I. *The Numbers of thoſe that Neglect all Publick Worſhip on the Lord's day.* p. 2

II. *The frequency of Sacraments.* p. 6

The Number of Communicants. p. 10

The Directory a hindrance to Communions. p. 13

Mr. *B's. Excuſes for few Communions Examined.* p. 14

III. *The Reading the Scriptures.* p. 19

IV. *The Myſteries of Religion.* p. 22

V. *The Catechiſm.* p. 28

VI. *Bodily Worſhip.* p. 30

VII. *The practice of Reverence by Diſſenters.* p. 38

VIII. *The Praiſes of God.* p. 39

IX. *The Rule of Human Prudence.* p. 40

X. *The Third, Fourth and Fifth Canons.* p. 48

XI. Mr. *Bs. Demands.* p. 49

XII. Mr. Sq. p. 53

XIII. *Perſonal Vindication.* * p. 57

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the Reasoning part of Mr. B's. Book.

Sect. I. MR. B's. *Stating the Case as to purity of Worship and Disci-pline.* p. 57
II. Mr. B's. *Partiality.* p. 63

APPENDIX

to CHAP. II.

Containing an Answer to Mr. B's Objections against the Sign of the Cross.

Sect. I. THe proper *Method to discover the ture nature of Sacraments as Signs.* p. 1
II. *That* Sacraments *are Primarily* Signs *of God's Grace, and not of our Duty.* p. 7
III. *That the* Scriptures *Warrant us to use other* Signs *that are not* Sacraments *for the several uses assigned by Mr.* B. *to* Sacraments. p. 21
IV. *Of Representing* Signs. p. 24
V. *Of Obliging* Signs. p. 33
VI. *Of Distinguishing* Signs. p. 42
VII. *That the Cross is such a* Sign *as the* Scriptures *Warrant.* p. 49
CONCLUSION. p. 61

A Second ADMONITION TO THE Diſſenting Inhabitants Of the Dioceſs of DERRY,

Concerning Mr. *J. Boyſe* his Vindication of his *Remarks* on a late Diſcourſe of *William* Lord Biſhop of *DERRY*,

CONCERNING

The Inventions of Men IN THE VVorſhip of GOD.

CHAP. I.

Concerning Matters of Fact.

1. I Thought it neceſſary in a former *Admonition* to give you ſome account of my deſign in my Book concerning *The Inventions of Men in the Worſhip of God*, in order to enable you to paſs a judgment on Mr. *Boyſe*'s *Remarks* on it: He has thought himſelf concerned to write a Vindication of them; And tho' I do not ſuppoſe it very neceſſary I ſhall give you a few Reflections on it.

It conſiſts of *Matters of Fact* and *Reaſonings*. I ſhall ſay a little to each of them; And leave you to judge of it. And I pray moſt heartily

MVSEVM BRITAN NICVM

heartily to God that it would pleaſe him to direct you. The matter is of great moment, ſince it concerns the Worſhip of God; and (whatever Mr. *Boyſe* would ſuggeſt) the true point is, *Whether about Nine in Ten of you ſhall Worſhip God publickly any where on the Lord's Day, or ſtay at home.* If I can prevail with you to come to the Eſtabliſhed Worſhip you may eaſily and conveniently worſhip God in your Pariſh Churches every Lords-Day, or oftner; and receive the Lords-Supper four times every Year, at leaſt, and oftner if you deſire it. But if I cannot perſwade you to this, about Nine in Ten of you muſt ſtay at Home, as you have done for many Years, and perhaps not have a fit opportunity of Communicating afforded you once in Seven Years.

Sect. I.

Concerning the Numbers of thoſe that neglect all Publick Worſhip on the Lord's-Day.

THis then ſhall be the Firſt Matter of Fact of which I ſhall endeavour to make you ſenſible, ſince Mr. *Boyſe* queſtions it, and jeſts at my concern about it, *Vind. p.* 2. The account he oppoſes to it is in theſe words, That *in the Pariſh of* Temple-more, *alias* Derry, *there are two Meetings, in which there will be found above* 2400 *who ordinarily Worſhip God every Lords-Day —— the leaſt Congregation amongſt you are ordinarily* 600, *and ſome above a thouſand that do Worſhip God every Lords-Day, ſo that where Miniſters are ſettled you do not know of one in twenty that do not ordinarily attend Publick Worſhip.* This account he ſays he has from your Miniſters: You will eaſily be Judges of the truth of it; and therefore I deſire you to conſider,

II. *Firſt*, That even in *Derry* there are Congregations much leſs than 600, and ſeldom in *Burt* above 400 or 500; and that thoſe two Meeting-Houſes, tho' the largeſt, will not hold 1200 to Hear. I ſent to count, and am aſſured both have not a thouſand ordinarily.

2*dly*, I deſire you to remember that tho' theſe Meeting-Houſes are both in the Pariſh of *Derry*, yet the Inhabitants of 11 Pariſhes depend on them, who have no nearer, or more convenient Meetings to go to: That is to ſay, *Fanthen*, *Deſertegny*, *Clonmany*, *Coldagh*, *Clonca*, *Donagh*, *Movill*, *Clandermot*, part of *Faughanvale*, part of *Cumber*, and part of *Donaghedey*; a Diſtrict in length from *Malin* to *Donaghedy* Church, about 33 Miles; and in bredth, from the Church of *Faughanvale* to the lower end of *Inch*, about 14 Miles: In which there

there are 14 Churches and Chappels; and in which 12 Conformable Clergy-men continually Officiate, Preaching in the Morning, and Catechiſing, for about one half of the Year, in the Afternoons, with an Explanation of ſome heads of the Catechiſm: This ſcope of ground is well Inhabited; and if I miſtake not, is near as big as the County of *Dublin*, and contains, at leaſt, one fourth part of the whole Dioceſs; and if there be in the Pariſh of *Temple-more* of your perſwation 2400 as Mr. *Boyſe* intimates, and I do believe there are, there can hardly be leſs in the other 11 Pariſhes than 4 times as many, and then in all, about 12000 depend on theſe two Meeting-Houſes; Of which I doubt if a thouſand attend Publick Worſhip on one Lord's-Day with another: And if we allow 1200 as Mr. *Boyſe* ſuggeſts, yet it doth not mend the matter; for it is ſtill but a tenth part of the whole.

III. Your next Meeting is yet in a worſe condition, for there depends on it *Tamlaghfinlagan* alias *Ballykilly*, *Drumchoſe*, *Aughanlow*, *Balteagh*, *Dongevin*, *Banagher*, part of *Cumber*, part of *Faughanvale*, and of *Tamlaghard*; a Diſtrict containing ſome of the richeſt and beſt planted Pariſhes in the County of *Londonderry*, and in length, from the point of *Magilligan* to the further part of *Banagher*, at leaſt 20 Miles; and in bredth from the Church of *Faughanvale* to the utmoſt part of *Balteagh* or *Drumchoſe* about 14. Yet here the Meeting-Houſe will not contain, as I am informed, above 400.

The like may be ſaid of the Meeting of *Aghadowy*; upon which there depend the Pariſhes of *Aghadowy*, *Kilrea*, *Deſertoghill*, *Errigill*, part of *Macoſquin*, part of *Tamlaghocrielly*, and the Chappel of *Fagevy*, in length from the old Church of *Camus*, to the moſt diſtant parts of *Tamlaghocriely* 13 or 14 Miles; and from the *Ban River* to the moſt diſtant parts of *Deſertoghill*, about 10 or 12: The like might be ſhewed of *Maghera*, *Ardſtra* and *Donaghmore*; and there needs no more to prove the truth of this than to conſult the Maps of the Counties.

IV. Let me add that even theſe are not conſtantly ſupplied; for the Miniſters, what on account of aſſiſting their Neighbour Miniſters at Sacraments, what on account of their viſiting other parts of the Kingdom; and what on account of their private Affairs, do frequently miſs and diſappoint their People; Inſomuch that in *Ardſtra*, for Example, their Miniſter has been abſent at leaſt 7 or 8 Months. If then we lay theſe things together, and take one Meeting and one Sunday with another, I think my Computation was very modeſt when I con-

jectured that hardly one in ten of you Worſhiped God any where on the Lords-Day.

V. But becauſe I would have as little diſpute with Mr. *Boyſe* as poſſible, I will take his own Computation, and allow,

1*ſt*. That there are 9 Meeting-Houſes in the Dioceſs; tho' really for the laſt 2 Years there has been only 8, and for the laſt 7 or 8 Months, only 7.

2*dly*, I will allow that there are 700 at each Meeting (Mr. *Boyſe* ſays 600 ordinarily, and ſome above a 1000) tho' really take one Sunday, and one Meeting with another, there are not 300.

3*dly*, I will allow that there are but 30000 Diſſenters in the Dioceſs; tho' really there are more. And now let us ſee how many Worſhip God on the Lords-Day; and how many profane it by ſtaying at home, according to Mr. *Boyſe*'s own Account: And it is thus; Nine times 700 make 6300, the Number of Worſhipers; which taken out of 30000, there remains 23700 that ſtay at home and attend no Worſhip at all. Perhaps half as many as Worſhip God in all the Diſſenters Meetings in *Ireland*. A thing that deſerves a ſerious Conſideration and Concern; and tho' Mr. *B*. ſeems to make light of it, (*Vind*. *p*. 2.) yet ſure to uſe my endeavours to perſuade theſe 23000 to attend their Pariſh Churches, rather than to ſtay at home on the Lords-Day, was my Duty as a Chriſtian Biſhop and Paſtour; And how Mr. *B*. will Anſwer to God, that he has contributed to hinder my Endeavours tho' he profeſs he did not deſign it, I leave it to our Common Judge and Maſter.

VI. Neither Mr. *Boyſe* nor your Miniſters could be ignorant of this, ſince it ariſes clearly from their own Computation. And I leave you to judge whether it look not like amuſing the World, and ſerving a Party to publiſh ſuch an Account as he and they have done: For to tell us of two Meeting-Houſes in one Pariſh, when indeed there are only thoſe two in one quarter of the Dioceſs, I am ſure looks like ſuch a deſign. Yet this has been your Caſe for many years paſt, and is like to be in great meaſure for many to come: For when can you expect Ten Miniſters more then you have in the Diſtrict of *Derry* and *Burt*? And yet theſe would be rather of the feweſt to accommodate each place with a Meeting at a due diſtance: When can you expect Seven inſtead of one in the Diſtrict of *Ballykelly*; or Six in the Diſtrict of *Aghadowy*, and proportionally in the reſt?

VII. I deſire you to obſerve that Mr. *B*. *p*. 26. declares that it was

was not his deſign to hinder you from joyning with the Eſtabliſhed Church in our ordinary Lords-Day Service, and *Expreſly Declares his own Opinion for the Lawfulneſs of it* : I hope your own Miniſters are of the ſame Opinion, ſince he profeſſes *p.* 24. That he had a juſt *call to write* his *Remarks, and that from the Diſſenting Miniſters of this Dioceſs* : And Three of them, by their Certificates, ſeem to approve of his Performances. If then it be their Opinion that it is lawful for you to joyn in Our Publick Worſhip, at leaſt when you can not go to your own Meetings, and that you had better do ſo than ſtay at home, eſpecially where the Eſtabliſhed Miniſters are ſober, able, orthodox and diligent, as thoſe of this Dioceſs I preſume generally are: I deſire you to call to mind whether your Miniſters have declared their opinion to you in this point or no. If they have, conſider how you will anſwer your neglect of God's Publick Worſhip ſo long, at the laſt day, when it ſhall appear you might lawfully have joyned in it.

But if your Miniſters have not made any ſuch Declaration of their Opinion in this point, tho' they know it to be Lawfull, judge with your ſelves whether they have diſcharged the Office of Faithful Guides to you, in revealing to you the whole will of God, as they ought to have done; ſince they have ſuffered for many Years, and yet do ſuffer about Nine in Ten of you, to ſtay at home on the Lord's-Day, and joyn in no Publick Service of God rather than joyn in the Worſhip, Praiſes, Prayers, and Sacraments Celebrated in your own Pariſh Churches, or hear the Scriptures Read, and the great Miſteries of the Kingdom of Heaven opened to you by ſuch Miniſters as you cannot but in your Conſcience acknowledge, and many of you have acknowledged, to be equal to your own in Piety, Learning, Diligence and Induſtry, and who would have been eminent amongſt you if they had been of Your Party.

I conceive the reſolution of this Queſtion to be of great Moment to you, and a great ſtep to our Peace and Union; and therefore you ought every one of you to require your Miniſters direct and poſitive Reſolution in it: By which you will perceive whether your Guides are of one mind in this weighty Affair, and if they be, you'l conſider how you came to be ignorant of it, as your Practice and Profeſſion declare you are, and where the fault is to be laid. I the rather preſs this becauſe I know that ſeveral are willing and deſirous to frequent the Publick Worſhip, but dare not, fearing the malice and and hatred of their Neighbours, who treat them as Apoſtates that do ſo, and contrive their Ruin.

The Truth is Your Miniſters have Preached you into a Diſlike of the Eſtabliſhed Worſhip, they have repreſented it as *Idolatrous*, and by theſe means they have intirely ſeparated you from us, as to all Publick Worſhip, and have got you to depend on themſelves: And now when they have you, they are not able to ſupply you, but have dealt with you as the falſe Mother did with the Child before *Solomon*, they would rather you ſhould not Worſhip God at all, than with us; But whether this look like *Zeal* for God's Worſhip, I muſt leave it with you to judge: As for my ſelf I hope I ſhall not be reputed (I am ſure I ſhall not become) your Enemy becauſe I tell you the Truth; And ſhall apply the words of St. *Paul*, *Gal.* 4. 17. to You and your Teachers, *They zealouſly affect you, but not well, they would Exclude you*, or rather *Us*, (as in the Margine of your Bibles) *that you may affect them.*

Sect. II.

Concerning Frequency of Sacraments.

I BUt, Secondly, Becauſe the frequency of your Sacraments (which is the next greateſt Matter of Fact) has a great dependance on this Laſt; I ſhall conſider it next, and compare my Aſſertions with Mr. *Boyſe*'s, and engage you to judge who comes neareſt the Truth.

My words at which Mr. *Boyſe* takes ſo great Exception are theſe, *Diſ. Chap* 5. *Sect.* 3. *N.* 3. *When People were relaxed from the particular and certain Rules of Our Church by the firſt breaking off of thoſe of your Perſwation from us, the Lords-Supper was laid aſide wholly for ſeveral Years by ſome Congregations.*

I appeal to You whether it is not yet reckoned a great thing among you if once in a Year or two a Communion be Celebrated in one of your Meetings, nay, among ſome of you it is omitted for ſeveral Years——By the beſt enquiry I could make, I could not compute that one in ten that go to your Meetings ever Receive thro' the whole courſe of their Lives——— I ſhould be glad to find that I were miſtaken in this Computation.

Mr. *B.* denies every one of theſe, with many hard words; and aſſerts, *p.* 136. That it is *Univerſally uſual in every Meeting where an Ordained Miniſter is, to have the Lords-Supper Adminiſtred once a Year and twice in the larger Towns.*

To

To convince the World of the Truth of what I ſaid, and of Mr. *Boyſe*'s miſtake I laid down the account of received of this Matter, and found that the Sacrament was Adminiſtred but about Nine times in Seven Years in all the Meeting-Houſes of the Dioceſs before the writing of my *Admonition*, which was *May* 1694, as appears from the date of it: Mr. *B.* is very ill pleaſed with my Computation, and alledges that a very *particular enquiry* has been made. (*Vind. p.* 16.) The Account of which he ſums up in theſe words, *The Year* 88 *falling within the Compaſs of the Seven Years mentioned by the Biſhop, you had it in that Seven Years* 22 *or* 23 *times.* If it had been thus it is very little to the purpoſe, ſince even ſo it doth not amount to once a Year in every Meeting where there was an Ordained Miniſter. But Mr. *Boyſe* might have Obſerved that Eight of theſe were Celebrated amongſt you laſt Summer, ſince my *Admonition*, that is at *Burt*, *Strabane*, *Donagmore*, *Ardſtra*, *Ballykelly*, *Aughadowy*, *Maghera* and *Derry*. This Laſt appears by the *Derry* Certificate it ſelf to have been *July* 22, 1694, near three Months after my *Admonition* was Written; which ſhews that he includes the Sacraments of Summer 1694. There remains then confeſſedly but about 14; and I do not think it material to contend about five Sacraments in a whole Dioceſs in Seven Years.

II But Secondly, Mr. *B.* is ſo far from ſhewing any miſtake in what I aſſerted that I think he has furniſhed me with a ſufficient proof of it, for he affirms, *p.* 16. That *after a very particular Enquiry* he finds in the Years 87 and 88 *The Sacrament was adminiſtred in* Derry *twice*, *in* Donagheede *twice*, *in* Drumrah *twice*, *in* Ardſtra *twice*, *in* Urny *twice*, *in* Donaghmore *twice*, *in* Lifford *once*, *in* Clandermot *once*. Theſe then are all the Sacraments, that your Miniſters on a particular Enquiry could find Adminiſtered in theſe two Years in this Dioceſs: And indeed I perceive they took great pains in the Enquiry, ſending Quærics about to this purpoſe; It appears then that in other Meetings in this Dioceſs there was none Adminiſtred in thoſe two Years, and of ſuch as had Ordained Miniſters there was theſe following.

1 Burt } *Mr.* Ferguſon *their preſent Miniſter.* } *No Sacrament in* 1687 *or* 88

They had before, Mr. *Grahms*, Mr. *Haunton*, Mr. *Haliday*; Theſe Officiated about 20 Years, and had but three Sacraments that I can find.

2 Ballykelly

2 Ballykelly	*Mr.* Crooke *their present Minister has served above* 30 *Years.*	*No Sacrament in* 87 *or* 88.

When or how often before not known.

4 Aughadowy	Mr. Boyd *their present Minister for above* 30 *Years.*	*No Sacrament in* 87 *or* 88.

Nor can I find when or how often before.

4 Tamlaghcrielp	*Mr.* Gilchrest *for many years before the Troubles.*	*No Sacrament in* 87 *or* 88.

Nor any before that I can find.

5 Macosquin	Mr. Lowry *before the Troubles.*	*No Sacrament in* 87 *or* 88

Before him they had, Mr. *Boyd*, Mr. *Wilson*, Mr. *Eliot*; but no Sacrament for 16 Years that I can find.

6 Maghera	Mr. Kilpatrick *who Officiated above* 20 *Years.*	*No Sacrament in* 87 *or* 88.

The Sacrament Administred Seven or Eight times, and no more in those 20 Years that I can find.

7 Dumboe	Mr. Wolson *till the troubles and four Years before.*	*No Sacrament in his time.*

Mr. *Blair* before, no Sacrament two Years before he died, I cannot find how many before.

8 Strabane	Mr. Wilson *before the troubles for* 20 *Years.*	*No Sacrament in* 87 *or* 88.

But one or two at the most in his time, as I can find.

Here you may observe that Eight Meetings in this Diocess for the Years 87 and 88, had no Sacrament at all, of the rest some had one, some had two, as is alledged; which to shorten the dispute, I will take for granted; since this is sufficient to prove, that it is a great matter if a Sacrament be Administred in one of your Meetings in a Year or two, which was my Assertion. And I have been so far from

from wronging you in it, that it appears, after the moſt ſtrict Enquiry that none had above one in a Year, in which number Mr. *B.* reckons ſix; two had but one in two Years, and eight Meetings had none at all in theſe two years.

But *Secondly*, How they behaved themſelves before thoſe two Years, appears ſufficiently from the Account I have added, and if there ſhould happen to have been twice more Sacraments then I have an account of, yet it would not excuſe Your Miniſters from a very Criminal Neglect, and fully juſtifies my Aſſertion, that the Sacrament is often omitted for ſeveral Years together in ſome of Your Meetings, and in ſome places for ten Years, or more: In which Number are *Tamlaugh o Crilly*, *Macoſquin* and *Strabane* the ſecond beſt Town in the Dioceſs.

Thirdly, It ſhews what you are to judge of Mr. *B*'s Aſſertion *p.* 14. *That it is Univerſally uſual in every Meeting where an Ordained Miniſter is ſettled to have the Lords-Supper Adminiſtred conſtantly once a Year*; Here are eight had none in two Years, and I doubt whether it has been a conſtant Cuſtom in any one Meeting to have it once a Year; at leaſt I have ſeen no Voucher for it.

III. As to his aſſerting *Your having the Lords-Supper adminiſtred conſtantly twice a year in the larger Towns*, I have told you in my *Admonition*, *p.* 153. *That I can call only three ſuch in this part of the Countrey, that is* Londonderry *and* Strabane *in this Dioceſs and* Colraine *in the border of it. Now as to* Londonderry *it has had this Sacrament adminiſtred but twice in Six or Seven Years, and* Colraine *but once in that time. And as to* Strabane, *tho' it, as well as the other, had a ſetled Miniſter in it, before and ſome time ſince the Troubles, yet I am informed from good hands, that in 26 Years the Lords-Supper has been Adminiſtred but twice in it.* The point then here is, whether the Holy Sament was Adminiſtred twice Yearly in larger Towns, in which number theſe three are, and if it was not then Mr. *B.* is miſtaken: As to what I aſſerted of *Colraine* and *Strabane* I find no doubt made; but he produces a Certificate from *Derry*, in which it is ſaid that the Sacrament was Adminiſtred *May* 87, *April* 88, *July* 91, *July* 92, *July* 93, and *July* 94. And the Certifiers deſire *That this may be compared with* the paſſage I have above cited out of *the Admonition*, *p.* 153. And Mr. *B.* adds *p.* 23. That *he hopes I will either yield this point or produce as credible Vouchers as theſe*: But I take this to be a full Voucher for what I there aſſerted, and a demonſtration that Mr. *Boyſe*

was miſtaken when he affirmed that the Sacrament was conſtantly Adminiſtred twice a Year in larger Towns, *Rem. p.* 136. This was the point in Queſtion, and Mr. *Boyſe*'s Voucher is poſitive againſt him in it. I ſay that in Six or Seven Years (that is from *May* 1688 till *May* 1694 when my *Admonition* was written) the Sacrament was Adminiſtred twice at *Derry* (in which the Certificate ſays *three times*) twice in 26 Years in *Strabane*, and once in *Colraine* in Seven: All the contradiction then between this Paſſage and the Certificate is concerning one time in *Derry*, that is 1691, the account of the other Towns being unqueſtionable. Now ſuppoſing my Informers miſtaken in this one time, I think it is very little to the purpoſe: Here is an Account of about 40 Years, and the Informers, as is pretended, miſt one Sacrament; whereas Mr. *Boyſe*'s Informers miſtook about 50 in 60 to make the whole come up to one a Year, as appears from this Certificate. But after all I am not ſatisfied that there is any miſtake at all in my Account in this one Sacrament in diſpute, and can produce good reaſons for my believing ſo, if it were worth the while: However I deſire the Oath that the Certifiers offer about the truth of their Certificate in all the parts of it, ſince it carries a manifeſt ſign of ſome tampering in it, being dated *Sept.* 25, 1694. and ſign-by *Alexander Lecky*, *Mayor Elect*, who yet, as every Body may know, was not Elected Mayor till *November* following. Upon the whole if Mr. *B.* had produced a Voucher that the Sacrament was adminiſtred twice a Year in each of theſe Towns, it had been ſomething to the purpoſe, but as it is now it makes directly againſt him. I am ſorry that I am forced to take Notice of theſe little things that are not to the Cauſe, for if inſtead of five Communions in ſeven Years (according to Mr. *B*'s account) you had had 14 in ſuch a Congregation as *Derry*, I ſhould ſtill reckon you very Negligent, and to have violated the Scripture Rule in an unexcuſable Manner.

Sect. III.

Concerning the Number of Communicants.

I. THe Second thing I affirmed concerning this Sacrament was, That *by the beſt enquiry I could make I could not compute that one in ten that go to your Meetings ever receive thro' the whole Courſe of their Lives*; In oppoſition to this he affirms, *That by the beſt Computation your Miniſters can make, there is not one in ten, rather in* 20 *or* 30

that

that do not receive, except ſuch as are with-held for want of competent knowledge, or on the account of Scandal. Rem. p. 137. There is a great difference between theſe two Aſſertions: I ſay one in ten, Mr. *Boyſe* and Your Miniſters ſay Nine in Ten, nay 19 in 20, or 29 in 30. Either they or I muſt be widely miſtaken, and which of us come neareſt the truth will appear on Examination of the Proofs which Mr. *B.* himſelf produces. In his *Vindication p.* 19. he aſſerts that *The Ordinary Hearers in the two Meetings of* Derry *and* Burt *are about* 2400—*That we may compute about* 1600 *Communicants in both: Now tho' we allow a conſiderable deduction out of this Number for Strangers that may be ſuppoſed to have received, yet the Number of Communicants belonging to thoſe two Congregations compared with that part of their Hearers that are of Age to receive, will ſufficiently demonſtrate that the Bps. Computation,* that not one in ten receive, *muſt be very wide from truth.*

II. Now to this I reply, *Firſt*, That Mr. *B.* has produced no Voucher of the Number of Communicants in Your Meetings before my Book and Admonition, theſe two Sacraments of which he ſpeaks being laſt Summer, one of them after the writing of my Admonition, and the other after it was publiſhed, and I hope I contributed to the Numerouſneſs of them.

But *Secondly*, Now your Miniſters have uſed their utmoſt endeavours, and brought as many as they cou'd to Communicate; let us examine whether Mr. *B.* or I come neareſt truth, in order to diſcover it. I deſire you to remember two aſſertions of Mr. *B*'s. the firſt *Remarks*, p. 136. *wherever* the Sacrament *is Adminiſtred 'tis uſual for two thirds of the Congregation to be Strangers—— And it is uſual for moſt of the Members of the Neighbouring Pariſhes to frequent it.* Secondly, *p.* 137. That thoſe *that Communicate once do it ordinarily on all following occaſions.* If then we take away two thirds from 2400, there remains 534; the proportion of 2400 belonging to theſe two Meetings that ever Communicated at once; which is not one in four; and is much nearer my computation than that of Mr. *B*'s or your Miniſters: And which is alone ſufficient to ſhew that I conſidered the matter better than they.

But *Thirdly*, I deſire you to obſerve that the 2400 are ſuppoſed to be of the Pariſh of *Derry*, and there is no account of the other 11 Pariſhes that depend on theſe two Meeting-Houſes: The not mentioning of which gives the matter a quite different face from what it really ought to have; and being conſidered, after all I ſee no reaſon

to

to alter my conjecture of one in ten. And this will appear from the following Suppoſitions which I think much nearer truth than Mr. *B*'s. Firſt I ſuppoſe that one fourth of thoſe that received at *Derry* received alſo at *Burt*; and on the other hand one fourth of thoſe at *Burt* came to *Derry*, otherwiſe it could not be true what he now aſſerts, *Vind. p.* 17. That the *moſt devout and ſerious* of you Communicate four or five times a Year. Secondly, I ſuppoſe that thoſe made up another fourth who came out of *Taboyn* and *Ray* Meetings nearer *Burt* than *Derry*, tho' in *Rapho* Dioceſs, and out of *Letterkenny*, *Strabane*, *Lifford*, *Donaghmore*, *Ballikelly*, *Rapho* and *Colrane*, and other remote parts, from every one of which there came ſome to *Derry*, and I believe to *Burt*; and then there remains 800 Communicants belonging to the 12 Pariſhes that I have ſhew'd depend on theſe two Meeting-Houſes, which is not a tenth part of them.

Fourthly, Let me obſerve that moſt other Meeting-Houſes are in worſe circumſtances then theſe, as I have already ſhewed; in *Ballykelly* there was no Sacrament confeſſedly from Summer 1686 till 1693, that is for ſeven Years, and then as I was informed there were not 400 Communicants; nor do I ſee any thing yet to oblige me to alter my account: But let it be 800, if we allow two thirds of theſe to be Strangers, according to Mr. *B*'s aſſertion, there remain 268 Communicants in that Diſtrict, in which there are five or 600 People. The like may be ſhewed of *Aghadowy*, *Maghera*, and others; All which conſidered I think I ſpake modeſtly when I ſaid one in ten.

III. But to comply with Mr. *B*. as much as I can, I will take his own Informations and examine this matter by them.

He mentions only one Sacrament Celebrated in each Meeting-Houſe amongſt you this Year, there are but eight in the Dioceſs, but I will allow ten Sacraments.

Secondly, He pleads for 1600 at two Sacraments in *Derry* and *Burt*; I will allow proportionally for each of the reſt; tho' really ſome had not 400. The Number then of Communicants in the Dioceſs were this Year 8000, and thoſe in effect are all that ever Communicated: For he affirms (as I already obſerved) that thoſe that Communicate once, do it ordinarily on all following occaſions. Of theſe two thirds were Strangers by his own Confeſſion, that is, ſuch as came from other Pariſhes or Dioceſſes, where they were likewiſe Communicants; From whence it follows that only 2666 diſtinct Perſons

Perſons Communicated; which is not one in ten of 30000 (the Number of thoſe of your Perſwation in this Dioceſs.)

Sect. IV.

The Directory a hindrance to Communions.

I. THere remains now my third Aſſertion to be Examined, that after the Eſtabliſhing your Government the Lords-Supper *was laid aſide wholly for ſeveral Years.* This, indeed I reckoned as an effect of your *Directory*, as you may ſee in my Book, *Chap.* 5. *Sect.* 3. *N.* 3. And to make it good, I will put you in mind that it orders *That how often the Lords-Suppers ſhall be Celebrated may be determined by the Miniſters and other Church-Governors. By other Church-Governours* the Aſſembly tell us in their *Humble Advice, &c.* are meant *Officers commonly called Elders.* From which it follows that where there are no ſuch *Elders* the people muſt want the comfort of this Sacrament; and the Parliament refuſing the Erection of ſuch *Elders* in every Pariſh, the body of the people of *England* were kept from the *Lords-Supper* for many Years: Inſomuch that in the Year 1649 I find Miniſters meeting together to determine this Queſtion, *Whether there were any Courſe warranted by the Word of God wherein Miniſters might proceed to the Adminiſtration of this Sacrament as their Caſe then ſtood.* I find ten of theſe Miniſters met at *Taunton*, and wrote a Letter dated *June* 13. 1649, on this ſubject to Mr. *Henry Jeanes of Chedzoy*, deſiring him that *He would be pleaſed to take the Queſtion into ſerious Conſideration, and give his thoughts of it*; and ſay they *We are the rather inclined to deſire your particular Reſolution therein, becauſe we underſtand that you have Adminiſtred that Sacrament, and therefore doubt not but you have ſome way ſatisfy'd your ſelf therein.* Upon this Mr. *Jeans* wrote a piece publiſhed 1650, Entituled the *Want of Church-Government no Warrant for a total omiſſion of the Lords-Supper, or a Debate of that Queſtion which hath ſo wonderfully perplexed many, both Miniſters and People, whether or no —— the Lords-Supper may be lawfully adminiſtred in a Church deſtitute of Ruling Elders.* He intimates *p.* 5. that they had omitted it five, ſix or ſeven Years together, and might *for the whole ſpace of the remainder of their Dayes, for*, ſaith he, *to ſuppoſe that we ſhall never live to ſee the Church of God here in* England *ſettled in a Preſbyterian way is a ſuppoſition of that, which is neither impoſſible nor improbable.*

II. From this you may Obſerve to what a miſerable condition Your *Directory* had brought the People of *England* as to the participation of this Inſtitution of Chriſt.

I do believe Mr. *Jean*'s Book might do good, and bring ſome to do what it ſeems he alone had ventured to do in thoſe parts, even to Adminiſter the *Lords-Supper*: Yet many continued in the Omiſſion of it, as appears by the Teſtimony of Dr. *Cauſabon* who lived at that time, and has this paſſage in his *Vindication of the Lords-Prayer*, publiſhed 1660 (*p.* 55.) *Publick Catechiſing ſo neceſſary to uphold Chriſtianity among Men, tho' not ſo pleaſing to itching Ears, as ordinary Preaching is; The uſe of the Sacraments which in Divers Pariſhes, were formerly duly Adminiſtred, are now ſcarce known or named.* Mr. *Boyſe* may give him hard words for this, as he gives me, but the thing is too notorious to be denied: And when it was thus in *Oxford* where Dr. *Owen* had the Government, and in *Dublin* till the Reſtauration, you may imagine how it fared with Country Pariſhes; whereas therefore Mr. *B.* would throw this practice of rare or no Communions peculiarly on you, 'tis manifeſt that you have only followed the Preſident ſet you in *England* and *Ireland* by the body of Diſſenters in their Proſperity, and they are concerned in it as well as you, tho' I did not addreſs my ſelf to them.

Sect. V.

Mr. Boyſe's *Excuſes for few Communions Examined.*

I. IT remains to Conſider ſome things that Mr. *B.* offers that ſeem to extenuate or excuſe Your Miniſters as to their rare Communions. The firſt is, *Rem. p.* 137. That Miniſters *of particular Congregations prepare their own People for it, by viſiting 'em round, Examing every particular Member anew, about their ſpiritual Eſtate, and and making due Enquiry about their Converſation; all which takes up a conſiderable time.* Now to this I anſwer that it is the duty of Miniſters to enquire concerning the Spiritual Eſtate of Your People, when it may be conveniently done; but there is no Obligation on them to Examine Men anew before every Sacrament: The Scripture ſays *Let a Man examine himſelf, and ſo let him Eat.* Your Directory requires no ſuch Examination, nor is it agreeable to the ſenſe of your own Party, as appears from the *Vindication of the Preſbyterial Government* by the *London* Miniſters 1649, who own (*p.* 59.) this *Examination*

on or Profeſſion is not required every time a Man comes to the Sacrament but only at their firſt Admiſſion, and a compleat Member is *by Virtue of his firſt Admiſſion freed from all after Examination: Except in Caſe of Scandal.* For your Miniſters therefore, on pretence of their Extraordinary pains in Examining, to Celebrate the Lords-Supper but once the Year, is, plainly to prefer their own Tradition to the Command of God, that requires frequent Celebration of this Sacrament.

II. But Secondly, Mr. *B.* alledges that you were Perſecuted, and that made you have the Sacrament ſo ſeldom; This he alledges for *Strabane* (*Vind. p.* 17.) but I anſwer,

Firſt, That Perſecution is no reaſon for omitting the Lords-Supper, any more than for omitting Sermons; whilſt your Miniſters could not get opportunity to Preach, they might be excuſed for omiſſion of this Sacrament, but it is full as eaſy to draw people together to receive the Sacrament, as to hear a Sermon; and to Adminiſter it to them, as to Preach twice, or once a day: If we will be content with the plainneſs and ſimplicity with which Chriſt Inſtituted it; and accordingly we find the firſt Chriſtians, in the deepeſt Perſecutions, were as conſtant in the one as in the other; and thought the receiving it then moſt neceſſary to fortify their Members with reſolution to endure Torments and Martyrdom. From whence it is manifeſt your Miniſters have a Notion of this Sacrament different from the Primitive Martyrs.

But Secondly, I deſire you to conſider your manner of Adminiſtring this Sacrament concerning which Mr. *B.* tells us (*Remarks p.* 137.) that amongſt you *Every Pariſh having uſually but one Miniſter 'tis requiſit the Miniſters of Neighbouring Pariſhes ſhould aſſiſt them on that occaſion; and conſequently they uſually bring their people along with them.* I may add that there are often four or five Miniſters at your Sacraments, and ſometimes 4 or 5000 People, when only 400 receive: You have likewiſe uſually a Sermon ſome day before, and the day after. I confeſs Perſecution is an effectual means to hinder the Celebration of the Lords-Supper in this faſhion, for no Government that is jealous of a People, will ſuffer them to meet or continue together in this manner. But I deſire you to remember that Chriſt never required theſe things at your hands, and therefore your omitting the Lords-Supper becauſe you were not permitted thus to Celebrate it, is another inſtance of Your Miniſters making void the Commands of God by their own Tradition.

Laſtly,

Laſtly, I believe ſome of Your Miniſters might be hindred from Publick Preaching and Sacraments for ſome ſhort time, that is, whilſt ſome of Your Brethren were in Arms againſt the Government at *Pentland-Hills*, and *Bothwell-Bridge*, againſt whom they never made any Publick Declaration, or Addreſs that I can learn; but that this continued for any conſiderable time, or that the Inſpection was ſo ſtrict that they might not have Adminiſtred the Lords-Supper as our Saviour Inſtituted it, doth not appear, nor is pretended: And it is manifeſt that this is only a pretence; ſince they were no leſs negligent in the Year 1687 and 88 when they had their full Liberty.

III. A Third thing offered by Mr. *B.* is *Vind. p.* 15. That *I know well enough that for two Years of the Seven, at leaſt, both the Miniſters and People were ſcattered and had no opportunity of Celebrating the Inſtitution.*

I muſt profeſs that I neither know nor have heard of any ſuch diſpertion of the People or Miniſters, as to hinder you from an Opportunity of Celebrating this Sacrament for 2 years. The *Iriſh* Army came into this Dioceſs about *April* 1688, and left it in *Auguſt* following; during which time ſome of Your Miniſters were in *Derry*, and ſome in *Scotland:* The People in the Country were then, and for a conſiderable time after, in a miſerable condition, and plundered of what they had; but there were ſtill great Numbers of them, and in their Circumſtances being depriv'd of Worldly Comforts, they needed, and I hope were prepared for Spiritual: But Your Miniſters did not afford it to them, as they ought to have done; and this I do ſtill make an *Aggravation of their Negligence*, tho' Mr. *B.* makes it an Argument of *Imprudence* in me to do ſo: But I deſire you to conſider the Caſe and judge. Mr. *Crooke* returned after the Siege to *Ballykelly* where there was ſtill a large Congregation, yet as he had been Negligent for two Years or longer before, ſo he continued unawakened by Gods Judgments in the ſame Negligence till Summer 1693. Mr. *Boyd* had the ſame Opportunity at *Aghadowy*, and yet ſhared in the ſame guilt. Mr. *Ferguſon* returned ſoon after the Siege to his Congregation at *Burt*, yet had no Sacrament till Summer 1692. Mr. *Craghead* returned ſoon likewiſe to his Congregation at *Donaghmore*, and after removed to *Derry*, and yet had no Sacrament till Summer 91, as is confeſſed at large in the *Derry* Certificate. So far were theſe from going about and Adminiſtring to their Afflicted and deſolate Neighbours, that they ſtarved their own Flocks, and kept them

them from this food of Life. And this they did, not only after the Siege till I came to this place, but in it at that time when continual deaths before their eyes, ought to have awakened them to more Devotion.

III. Mr. *B.* alledges, *Vind. p.* 16. That the Conformists there ought to have a share in this reproof: For those that he *has desired to enquire upon the place could not learn that they Administred it more than the other.* I have enquired of this matter, and am assured by those that Received at that time, that this Holy Sacrament was Administred Monthly in the Cathedral, as was usual, that 11 Clergy-Men received it together, and that towards the latter end, when Wine grew scarce, Dr. *Walker* reserved a proportion for the Sacrament, and when he apprehended it would not hold out, he declared that rather than not Celebrate he would mix it. A Practice much more allowable than omitting it: Besides the publick Administration, it was frequently Administred to the sick; And as to the Clergy that remained in the Diocess they behaved themselves worthy of their Character, Travelling on foot many Miles to visit the Sick, Baptize and Preach; And as soon as they could procure Wine (which was not to be had till after the Siege was rais'd) Administred the Lords-Supper, which so many as were not chas'd by the Enemy from their Cures, had done the *Easter* before, and did again *Christmas* after.

IV. But now I must tell you that Recrimination, if true, is a plain Confession of Guilt, and a sign of a desperate Cause; It may be very proper for a man that has Authority, and is called to it by his Duty, as I take my self to be, to reprove what he finds amiss amongst those that he conceives to belong to his Inspection. But for any one to go about to defend the Guilty by recriminating, is to harden and encourage them in their sins, by finding them out Examples and Presidents for their wickedness, and is in effect to tell them, what they are too apt of themselves to offer as an excuse for the worst of Practices, that *others are as ill as they.* Surely Examples fortify most of the World in Sin, and I am heartily sorry that any one of Credit should point out this way of recrimination to harden them by it. He is very guilty that has no way to clear himself but by blackening another; and when that is done, without truth, as the case is here, it is a grief to a good Man to think that serving a Party should Influence any to do it.

V. But Mr. *B.* gives me very hard words (*Vind. p.* 15.) for

looking back no further then my own time in my account of Sacraments administred in the Eſtabliſhed Church; whereas I give an account of yours for ſeven Years. If I had for 30 I do not ſee any harm in it; but the truth was, that many Miniſters were dead, and I could not meet with any that readily could inform me. But to ſatisfy you, that I had no deſign in this, I will now give you the beſt Account I can get for theſe three Years that are omitted. Tho' I ſuppoſe all are not come yet to my knowledge.

In the Year 1688 the Sacrament of the Lords-Supper was Adminiſtred in the Cathedral.	12	
In the Pariſh Churches.	83	
In the Catheral, in the Year 1689.	12	times.
In the Pariſh Churchess.	41	
In the Year 1690, in the Cathedral.	12	
In the Pariſh Churches.	39	
In all.	199	

And now I do not ſee what advantage it was to me to have omitted this, or why Mr *B.* ſhould expreſs ſuch reſentment at it. St. *Paul* Cautions us againſt *Evil Surmiſings*, 1 *Tim.* 6. 4. And whether the imputing this to *Diſingenuity in me* be of that ſort, I leave you to judge; if you compare the two years of the Troubles there is 104 of ours to none among you.

VI. The laſt excuſe Mr. *B.* makes for your Miniſters, is, their *Sickneſs*; this he alledges in behalf of Mr. *Wilſon* for *Strabane*, Mr. *Rowal* for *Lifford*, and Mr. *Crooke* for *Ballykelly*; but this is no excuſe: Theſe were as negligent when well, as ſick; and none of them was a year without Preaching ſeveral *Sundays* twice: And it is full as eaſy to Adminiſter the Sacrament to two or three hundred, as to Preach a Sermon. It is uſual for 3 or 4 of your Miniſters to aſſiſt at Neighbouring Sacraments, and one aſſiſtant would have prevented any diſappointment of the People, which Mr. *B.* ſays (*Vind. p.* 16.) happened twice at *Balindret*. Miniſters that are infirm may very lawfully omit one of their Sermons on the Lords-Day, and Adminiſter the Sacrament in lieu of it; In which Caſe there is no hardſhip on them, ſince the People give it to one another amongſt you, without any bleſſing at the delivery to each: Neither doth your *Directory* re-

quire

quire the Miniſter to make any Exhortation whilſt the People are receiving, nor after they have received, only ſays, he *may in a few words put them in mind, &c.* And therefore whilſt your Miniſters make two Sermons a-day, and yet pretend diſability for Adminiſtring the *Lords-Supper*, we muſt reckon this another inſtance of your making void the Commands of God by your own Tradition. A Sermon that juſtles out the Sacrament, is a Human Invention, as much as Alms that hinder a Man from relieving his Parent. *Mark* 7. 11

VII. Theſe are all the excuſes that Mr. *B.* ſeems to have made for you, and I doubt they will appear very ſlender in the eyes of God, when he calls your Teachers to an account for their Stewardſhip in diſpenſing the Miſteries of God. It had been much more proper methinks for a Chriſtian Miniſter to have reproved you for your negligence, than to have denied plain *Matter of Fact*, and pleaded ſuch Excuſes.

Mr *B.* doth both in his *Remarks* and *Vindication*, object to us the Dioceſs of *Down* and *Conor*; I think he has little reaſon to do it to *Me*: But I muſt now tell you, that the neglects there were neither ſo Univerſal, nor unexcuſable as theſe of your Miniſters have been in this particular; and had you been in *Chancery*, *Michaelmas* Term laſt, you would have heard as much ſaid for the moſt negligent there, as Mr. *B.* has written for your Miniſters; which only ſhews that Money and intereſt will find colours for every thing. But the negligence of your Miniſters ſufficiently ſhews the want of Diſcipline amongſt them; and that the Inſpection of a Biſhop would do them no harm: And I hope this *Admonition* will not hurt you, nor them. I ſhall think I have done a good work, and thank God for it, if I can awaken you to more care for the future; and reckon that the nearer you come to the Scripture Rule, the nearer you will come to us, and there will be the more hopes of an Union, which I ſhall always heartily endeavour.

Sect. VI.

Concerning the Reading the Scriptures.

I. THe third *Matter of Fact* in diſpute between Mr. *B.* and Me, is concerning your *Reading the Holy Scriptures.* The words he excepts againſt are theſe (*Diſc. Chap.* 3. *S.* 3. *N.* 3.) but the *moſt ſad and deplorable defect of your performances of this Duty is your caſting*

casting out the word of God from most of your Publick Assemblies, directly contrary to God's Institution and Ordinance for the Instruction of his Church, insomuch that in many of your Meetings, *setting aside a Verse or two for a Text or Quotation, at the discretion of the* Minister, *the voice of God is never publickly heard amongst them——And in all the* Meetings *in the North of* Ireland *in a whole Year perhaps there is not so much Scripture Read, as one day in our Church——And 'tis a sad thing that a man may go to most* Meetings, *many Years, and never hear one intire Chapter read in them.*

The things asserted here are,

First, That the Reading of the Word of God, as God Instituted and Ordained it for the Instruction of his Church, is cast out of most of your Meetings. I shewed that God ordered his Word to be read *Regularly and in Order*, and that this Reading of it is cast out not only of most of your Meetings, but out of all of them, there not being one of them that yet appears to have read either Testament through in 30 Years before the writing of my *Discourse*, or indeed ever that I can learn; And therefore till I see good Vouchers that the Word of God has been thus Read, I think there can be no question of the Truth of this Fact. It is not only the manner of Reading is here in Dispute, and denied by me, but the thing it self, of which we can never be sure without the Manner be settled; for when there is a certain method for Reading the Word of God, as in our Church, we can be sure that it is Read: But this is so far otherwise with you, that no Man that ever I yet met with, or could have an account of, could vouch that he heard so much of the Bible read in your Meetings in his whole Life as is read in the Cathedral of *Derry* every Year; and in many other Churches; and ought by our Rules to be in all. Now when a Man has been a Hearer 50 Years in Your Meetings and cannot affirm that ever he heard two intire Books of the Bible read in them, I reckon that the Word of God, as God requires it for the *Instruction of his Church* is cast out of those Meetings, and that they act directly contrary to his Command. Therefore except Mr. *B.* produce Vouchers, that in most of your Meetings, the whold Word of God, or the most material parts of it, have been read in a competent time, he will never acquit them before God, or impartial Men, of this fault: If the Books that have been Read, and the time be specified, the Truth will then appear, but without this I shall look on any general assertion as a subterfuge, and a declining the light.

II. The

II. The Second thing aſſerted by me, is, That in many of your Meetings, ſetting aſide a verſe or two for a Text or Quotation, at the Diſcretion of the Miniſter, the Voice of God is never heard. This is owned by Mr. *B.* to be true, in effect, as to the Winter-Quarter in moſt of your Meetings (*Rem. p.* 92.) but how far this Winter-Quarter is ſtretched, wants being cleared; for ſome have ſtretched it very far: And as to thoſe that he affirms now to Lecture in Winter in this Dioceſs, I deſire to know how long they have thus Lectured. Laſt Winter I believe they did, but I muſt ſee a good Voucher before I believe that either all of them Lectured any part of every Year before, or all but one, conſtantly in the Winter.

Secondly, You have Meetings in the Afternoons, as well as in the Mornings, and the Scriptures ought to be read in them, but in theſe you have only a Text and Quotations; and therefore what I affirmed is true, not only of many of your Meetings, but of one half of them all.

III. The Third thing oppoſed by Mr. *B.* is, That perhaps in all the Meetings in the *North* there is not ſo much Scripture Read as in our Church in one Day. To prove this I took Mr. *B*'s own Conceſſions (*Remarks p.* 92.) and according to them, ſhewed that there was really four times more Scripture Read in our Church in one Day than in all the Meetings in the *North* in a Year: But he ſeems not willing to ſtand to theſe Conceſſions, and farther excepts (*Vind. p.* 9.) That eleven *Pſalms* which I reckon as *Chapters read for Inſtruction*, were *Forms of Thankſgiving*. But I anſwer, That theſe agree very well together; the Apoſtle having Commanded us to Teach and Admoniſh one another in them at the ſame time we ſpeak or ſing them: As appears from *Epheſ.* 5. 19. and *Col.* 3. 16. And indeed it is manifeſt that the *Pſalms* were written for Publick Inſtruction as well as for Publick Thankſgivings and Prayers: Twelve of them bear the Title, *For Inſtruction* before them, as moſt of them are called *Prayers*, *Pſal.* 72 20. *&c.*

Secondly, He will have two Chapters allowed for Quotations in your Sermons every Day; but I particularly excepted Quotations from the account. And quoting Scripture is not Reading it, nor is that the way God appointed his Word to be Read, *Deut.* 31. 10. Nor did the People of God ſo Read it: Nor doth your *Directory* preſcribe this as Reading, but Preaching. Laſtly, No body knows what or how many theſe are, or how they are applied; All theſe depending

on the Diſcretion of Your Miniſters: But after all he makes his Computation, and concludes that in a whole Year there is near as much Read in your Meetings as in two Days in our Church; for ſaith he (*Vind. p.* 10.) *In the Nine Meetings of this Dioceſs there are Read in a Year* 1287 *Chapters*; of which 936 are Quotations: And in one Day in Our Church but 714, *which is a little more than half what is Read in theſe Nine Meetings* in the whole Year. This is truly his Concluſion; and I value your time more than to diſpute about it, and therefore let it ſtand ſo.

IV. The laſt thing I aſſerted in this Matter was that a Man might go to moſt Meetings many Years, and never hear one intire Chapter Read in them: What has been done may be done; and I have met with ſeveral that have thus frequented Meetings ſeveral Years, and could not ſay they had heard an intire Chapter Read at a time: I ſent one to enquire, and he returned an account only of ſix Verſes Read for a Text to the Lecture; And I have been informed that uſually no more were Read. And therefore whereas Mr. *B.* aſſerts (*Rem. p.* 92.) that uſually a whole Chapter was Read; this may be true ſince my Book, but that it was otherwiſe before is Notorious. But when it appears what Books have been Read in each Meeting every Year before, 'twill be eaſy to judge how much has been Read each Lords-Day; And without this it is impoſſible to judge exactly of it, and till I ſee particular Evidence to the contrary I muſt ſuppoſe that what happened in theſe times when I ſent to enquire was what was uſual. Upon the whole, the ſlight you put on the Word of God, by throwing it out of your Meetings, when you cannot have time to put your own Gloſſes on it, your allowing two hours to your Sermons, and not ten Minuits to the Reading God's Word, are faults that Mr. *B.* may endeavour to palliate, but will never ſolidly juſtify. The true way to anſwer them is to mend them, and I am heartily glad to hear that you have made ſome progreſs that way, tho' far from what is requiſit.

Sect. VII.

Concerning the Myſteries of Religion.

A Fourth *Matter of Fact* denied by Mr. *B.* is that a Man may frequent your Meetings all his Life, and yet have no ſecu-

rity,

rity, or hardly poſſibility of Learning, from your Publick Teaching, all the great Myſteries of his Religion.

I laid before you in my former *Admonition p.* 17. the Excellent Method Our Church had taken to ſecure the Publick Teaching of all the great Myſteries of Chriſtianity to all her Members, by appointing a certain time in the Year for each of them; whereas there is no ſuch Rule or Order for your Miniſters: And whereas Mr. *B.* aſſerted there was an Obligation put on you by the *Directory* to teach all thoſe Myſteries, I ſhewed he was miſtaken; and he now contends (*Vind. p.* 12.) that you need none *beſides the Scriptures*: Which is (as I ſhewed in my *Admon. p.* 20.) a very great defect ſince the Scriptures require we ſhould have ſuch a Rule beſides.

II. *Secondly*, I ſhewed that I had examined and put it to many of your perſwaſion, whether they ever heard any of your Miniſters that profeſſedly made a whole Diſcourſe on the *Trinity*, *Conception*, *Nativity*, *Reſurrection*, *or Aſcenſion of our Saviour*; *or on his ſending down the Holy Ghoſt*, and I did, *and do profeſs that I never met one Man that could ſatisfy me in it*, *or aſſure me that his Miniſter had done it*: And I concluded from hence that it was a moſt dangerous matter to leave theſe things to Mens choice.

III. To this Mr *B.* replies, *Vind.* 11. That *I overlooked the plain Evidence*, nay the *Demonſtration* he produced againſt the truth of this charge in theſe words, That *Your People are in Publick Teachings yearly Catechiſed*, *in which Exerciſe all the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion are Explained to them.* But I anſwer,

Firſt, That I did not overlook this, but particularly anſwered it, where I thought moſt proper, *Admon. p.* 23. and ſhewed that there is no Rule in Your *Directory*, that requires your Miniſters to Examine either Privately or Publickly; So that their performances in this point are meerly Voluntary, and therefore their Hearers can have no ſecurity by this.

Secondly, I added that your *Directory* doth exclude Catechiſing from being any part of God's Publick Worſhip, either *Ordinary* or *Extraordinary*, as appears from the Preface to it, which propoſes it as Rules *for all parts of Publick Worſhip*; and likewiſe from the Title, which pretends the ſame: And yet the Book ſays not one word concerning Catechiſing, but Excludes it by Excluding our Common-Prayer-Book, that requires it as a part of Publick Worſhip: So that amongſt you, whatever Mr. *B.* pretends, Catechiſing is *No*

Publick

Publick Teaching, nor are your People, by any Rule that I know amongſt you, obliged to attend it in Publick; and this I reckon as another inexcuſable defect of your *Directory*.

Thirdly, Your way of Catechiſing is not ſufficient for this purpoſe. Mr. *B.* deſcribes your manner of Catechiſing thus, *Rem.* p. 85. *They divide their Pariſhes into ſo many Diſtricts, and accordingly for every Diſtrict once a Year, they Publickly appoint the time and place when they intend to Catechiſe them, and accordingly go thro' the whole Catechiſm with 'em.* I will add the account I had of this Matter from good hands. *The Diſſenters practice in Inſtructing and Examining the Younger ſort is in this manner. The Miniſter has a Meeting for this purpoſe in ſix ſeveral places in this Pariſh, and Examins once a Year in each place. His Method is to take four or five heads of their Catechiſm, and to ask queſtions concerning them, and expound them, according to which Method if they took the Catechiſm in Order, which yet I do not find they do, the Miniſter would be at leaſt ten Years in going over the whole of it in one place.*

Let us ſuppoſe then a Man conſtantly to attend Catechiſing in his Diſtrict, once a Year, yet it is impoſſible the Miniſter ſhould teach him all the Myſteries of our Religion ſufficiently, at one time; and if he take one Myſtery at once, which is as much as he can do, if he explain it as he ought, you ſee what it comes to: He has no ſecurity of hearing them all explained at any time, your Miniſters not being bound to any Method, and if they ſhould bind themſelves to one, yet ſo many years are required to go thorow them, that a Man has no ſecurity to live ſo long. But further I find that Catechiſing is generally amongſt you only in Order to a Sacrament, and whilſt there are no Sacraments Adminiſtered, there is uſually no Publick Catechiſing; and then Judge in what Condition thoſe places were that wanted Sacraments, for Seven, Ten, or more Years. And perhaps to avoid the trouble of Examining, was the very reaſon that there were none Celebrated, as Mr. *B.* himſelf partly confeſſes. The Truth is this ſeems to me a meer pretence ſet up to excuſe your Miniſters for their Negligence in Preaching the Goſpel, that is the greateſt, the higheſt and moſt neceſſary parts of it; it being plain that a Man may remain ignorant of them all his life, notwithſtanding your Publick Teaching, whatever Mr. *B.* pretends to the contrary.

IV. But *Secondly*, He objects that your Miniſters *moſt frequently inſiſt on the particular myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion* (*Vind* p. 12) And

And quotes a paſſage from one of them affirming it and taxing me moſt ſeverely for aſſerting the contrary. But I Anſwer, Theſe are but general Affirmations of the Perſons accuſed, without any particular proof. I told you in my *Admonition* p. 18. That the *Greateſt Myſteries of the Goſpel are the Conception, Birth, Paſſion, Reſurrection, Aſcention, and final coming of our Saviour to judge the quick and dead; The Doctrine of the Trinity, in whoſe Name we are Baptized, and the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt.* Let me add to theſe, tho' they are includded in them, *the manifeſtation of our Saviour to the Gentile World*, which the Scriptures reckon a great Myſtery, the *Communion of Saints in one Catholick Church*, and the Doctrine of *Repentance* and *Forgiveneſs of Sins.* Each of theſe are, and ought to be at leaſt once, or twice a Year ſolemnly and profeſſedly taught in our Church, at their proper and appointed times, and in the Explanation of our Catechiſm: So that we are ſure that at leaſt we ſhall hear them ſo often. Now to know whether Your Miniſters or Ours Preach the Goſpel moſt Diligently, Faithfully and Expreſly: It is not ſufficient to ſay in general that you do it often, but we muſt know how often each Miniſter has ſolemnly, profeſſedly, and in a full Diſcourſe explained and enforced each of theſe Myſteries.

V. For *Secondly*, it is not ſufficient for one to pretend that by the by, and on occaſion they have touched theſe Myſteries; for they are of that Nature and Moment that People ought to be taught that theſe, and none elſe, are the peculiar Myſteries of the Goſpel; that all other Knowledge or Preaching is of little value in reſpect of teaching theſe; and the Miniſters that teach them plainly, diligently and ſolidly are the true Preachers of the Goſpel, and thoſe that Preach them ſlightly and ſeldom are unfaithful Stewards. That each of them is of that conſequence that to explain them prove them from Scripture, enforce them, and preſs and ſhew the benefits and effects of them, requires frequent and particular ſett Diſcourſes upon them; and the leaſt that can be expected, is, that they be handled once every Year Solemnly, Fully and Profeſſedly.

And here let me deſire you to recollect your Memory, and conſider whether you have heard each of theſe treated thus before my Book appeared: If you did, you have reaſon to think your Miniſters Preached in earneſt the Goſpel to you; but if they omitted any of theſe, if they did not give you at leaſt one Sermon on each of theſe great Articles in a Competent time, they omitted ſo much of the

Goſpel, and were unfaithful Stewards of the Myſteries committed to them; and muſt be judged ſo if they continue in this Neglect. I ſhall be glad if they amend it, but am ſure the Order in Our Church provides better againſt it.

VI. We hear Complaints every day as if the Goſpel were not Preached in Our Church, we are *reproached as if we taught little but Morality*, and Mr. *B.* talks of *Deſolate Congregations amongſt us*. Now while theſe Myſteries are Solemnly, Conſtantly, Solidly and Profeſſedly taught at leaſt once a Year in every one of our Churches, bating Accidents of Sickneſs, *&c.* Judge with your ſelves how unjuſtly we are accuſed, and what ill terms I ſhould have received, if I had charged you with ſuch a Crime, when your Innocency was ſo demonſtrable; But till you produce as plain, certain and obligatory a Rule for the teaching of them as I have done amongſt us, you can never be ſo ſecure of learning them from your Miniſters Publick Teaching, as we are: I muſt profeſs again that I have put it to many of you my ſelf, and have got others to do the ſame, and could never be aſſured that they heard one Diſcourſe profeſſedly on the *Trinity*, *Conception*, *Nativity*, *Reſurrection* or *Aſcention* of our *Saviour*, or his ſending down the *Holy Ghoſt*; much leſs one or two every Year as it is with us. And till Mr. *B.* produce Vouchers of the times and places, I ſhall believe thoſe that have been thus put to it, would have told a thing ſo Remarkable, and in which the honour of their Miniſters is ſo much concerned, if they could have done it with truth.

VII. *Fifthly*, Thoſe People that have for many Years complained that Chriſt and the Goſpel was not Preached amongſt us, may juſtly be ſuſpected not to underſtand what the Goſpel is: And whilſt they accuſed us of Preaching nothing but *Morality*, I am afraid that they reckon theſe Myſteries, and our preſſing the neceſſity of a good Life from them, only dead and Moral Preaching, and that they expect ſome greater and more Spiritual Myſteries from us: But if any pretend to ſuch, they are unfaithful Teachers, and fall under the Apoſtles cenſure. *Gal.* 1. 8.

VIII. Laſtly, Let me ſay one word to you of our own Communion. You ſee (my Brethren) what an Excellent Order our Church has Eſtabliſht to ſecure your being taught all the Myſteries of the Goſpel, by appointing a peculiar time of the Year for Teaching each of the Principal of them: This way of keeping the great Works and Mercies of God in Memory, is what Nature teaches us as the moſt effectual

fectual Method, and it is alſo approved by Precedents in both the Old and New Teſtament, and is of ſuch force, that experience ſhews us that this one Rule, well obſerved, has been the principal means of preſerving Chriſtianity in the worſt of times, and under the moſt barbarous Tyranny and Perſecution of the * *Turks*; And therefore let me entreat you as you love your Saviour, and expect a ſhare in the happineſs of his Kingdom, that you would diligently obſerve thoſe times appointed by the Church for the Inſtructing you in the Myſteries of his Kingdom; whilſt you do ſo, you are ſure that you will be fed with the true bread of Life, the old and ſubſtantial Articles of your Faith, that are able to ſave your Souls; and will not be lead away with every wind of Doctrine, or new coined Myſteries of great pretenders: Therefore let neither the Abuſes or Arguments of your Adverſaries diſcourage you, nor much leſs coveteouſneſs or lazineſs divert your attendance: And remember if at any time your Miniſters do not Teach them, it is contrary to the Order of Our Church, and proceeds generally from your Non-attendance, and then you only are guilty of the Neglect.

* Dr. *Smith* in his Preſent State of the Greek Church owns that he admired, whence it came that ſo few of the Eaſtern Chriſtians were Proſelited to Mahometiſm, conſidering their Circumſtances, and Concludes *p.* 14. *Præſens ſatis edoctus tandem dedici, &c. At laſt being on the place I learnt that the Solemn Obſervation of Feſtivals and Faſts by God's Aſſiſtance prevented the whole Eaſt from falling intirely from the Chriſtian Faith; Chiefly, if not only by means of theſe the Chriſtian Religion Triumphs over ſo many moſt cruel Contrivances, being ſecured and fenced by this as by a holy Charm againſt the poyſon of Mahometiſm, for by the return of theſe Feaſts, which are Celebrated with great Crowds, by a holy Emulation, The Hiſtory of the Birth, Death and Reſurrection of Chriſt, and the reſt of the Myſteries that make up the ſum of Our Religion are brought to their Memory, &c.* And he obſerves that the Hiſtory of the Apoſtles and Martyrs, with their Courage and Patience repreſented in the days of their Commemoration, is that which arms them with courage to endure all the Cruelties and Perſecutions of the Turks.

Sir *Paul Ricaut* ſpeaking of the Conſtancy of the *Greeks* in the Chriſtian Religion, has theſe words, *p.* 15. *If any art or policy can be ſaid to have place over the affections of the people, none ſeems more efficacious then the ſtrict Obſervation of their Faſts and Feaſts of their Church, by which the people are Taught, as in a Viſible Catechiſm, the Hiſtory of Chriſtianity, more (I dare ſay) than by their ill compoſed Sermons, or Repetition of the Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue. For being ſeverely impoſed, and obſerved with much Solemnity they affect the Vulgar with an air of ſomething Divine.*

Sect.

Sect. VIII.
Concerning the Catechiſm.

I. A Fifth Matter of Fact denied by Mr. *B.* is, That *hardly one in ten get your Catechiſm by heart, nor one in five hundred retain it.* This I proved by my own Experience, and can by the Teſtimony of many Witneſſes that were preſent at the Tryals, to which Mr. *B.* replies, *Vind. p.* 13. That *this is to be imputed to the ſullenneſs, or the baſhfulneſs of thoſe I examined:* But I found no ſuch thing as baſhfulneſs in them; and as to ſullenneſs, many of them were under Obligations to me, being my Tenants or otherwiſe obnoxious; And they generally endeavoured to anſwer, but could not remember either the Words or Matter. I got ſeveral to make the ſame Experiment, and they returned me the like account.

II. Mr. *B.* alledges that there are in the Pariſh of *Derry* two Meetings, *And in thoſe two Congregations* 600 *can give a good account of and repeat the Aſſembly's Catechiſm.* To this I reply,

Firſt, That this Tryal is ſince my Book, and doth not come home to the time of which I ſpeak; I am glad if ſo many can do this, and believe my Book contributed to it.

Secondly, There are in thoſe Meetings 2400 Hearers in their Rolls, and then after all their Labour and pains, only one in four has gotten it.

Thirdly, There are many in this Pariſh that do not enter themſelves in your Books, and yet go to your Meetings, and no where elſe, there is no account of theſe who are the moſt ignorant.

Fourthly, Here is no account of the whole Diſtrict that depends on theſe Meetings, of which 600 is not the tenth, if the twentieth part.

Fifthly, A Catechiſm is chiefly deſigned for the ignorant, and ſuch as cannot Read; and here is no voucher that one ſuch has it, and they generally ſpeaking are never like to get it, ſo that Your Catechiſm is uſeleſs to thoſe to whom it is moſt neceſſary.

Sixthly, Here is no aſſurance how many of theſe will retain it for any conſiderable time: An Experiment has been made of this, and a Man of good Natural parts has not been able to retain it a Month after Examination: I am ſure ſome Eminent Perſons of your Perſwaſion could not give an Account of it ſometime before I Publiſhed my

my Book, I accidentally diſcourſed four or five of them about repairing a burying place, and prov'd to them that it was a duty ſo to do, from that queſtion in your Catechiſm, *What benefits do Believers recieve from Chriſt at death*, to which the anſwer is, that *The ſouls of Believers are at their death made perfect in holineſs, and do immediately paſs into Glory, and their Bodies being ſtill United to Chriſt do reſt in their Graves till the Reſurrection.* Therefore to expoſe their Bodies to Doggs or Swine, or any other Indignity, is to affront Chriſt to whom they are United. They ſeemed ſurprized at this and as I underſtood afterward, did not believe me, till they went and conſulted the Catechiſm; From whence I concluded that they did not know, or believe the Doctrine thereof; much leſs remember the words, which indeed I did not expect from them.

Laſtly, I do not believe your Miniſters can certainly tell who have the Catechiſm, and who have not: The Queſtions they ask are ſo few of each, and ſo confin'd to one head (as I am informed) that perhaps there are very few for whom they could vouch on ſuch Examinations: And often the Perſons gueſs before-hand in what place of the Catechiſm they ſhall be Examined, and prepare for it. Upon the whole, I am afraid my concluſſon is too near a Truth; and I am confirmed in it by Experiments every Day. In which I do not expect the repeating the Catechiſm, but the *Lords Prayer* and *Ten Commandments* and *Belief*, which many either never learned, or have forgotten. Theſe then are not *raſh or miſtaken Accuſations*, as Mr. *B.* alledges (*p.* 11.) but the effect of Tryal and Certainty. I can very well diſtinguiſh between ſilence and ignorance, whatever Mr. *B.* ſuggeſts. All that he alledges to juſtify his pretences, is (*Vind. p.* 2) that *Any one that conſiders the genius of that People, and their particular diſſatisfaction with his Lordſhip, will be eaſily inclined to believe this to be the genuine account of the matter.* I do believe your Miniſters whom I have reproved, are angry at me; and ſome (I am informed) in this Countrey pray againſt me by Name in their Pulpits; and thoſe joyn with them that are deep in your Intereſts, as it is a Faction, rather then a Religion. But I thank God I do not find any ſuch diſſatisfaction as Mr. *B.* would have the World believe. On the contrary, I find great reſpect from the Pious and Humble; and many have been ſo far from *Sullenneſs*, when I have diſcourſed them, that they have even with tears bewailed their Ignorance. So that I do not find all the Endeavours that have been uſed, or the Miſrepreſen-

tations ſpread either by Mr. *B.* or your Leading Men have been able to hinder, in a great meaſure, the effect of my Book; and even they that are moſt angry at it, are forced for very ſhame to mend ſeveral things; and ſome have had their Eyes opened by it, and do not only frequent their Pariſh Churches, but Communicate in them.

Theſe are all the *Matters of Fact* of which I took Norice in my *Admonition*, and you ſee (without troubling my ſelf with any other Informations than thoſe Mr. *B.* has Publiſhed) the truth ſufficiently appears in every particular: Yet he is not content with theſe, but renews ſeveral others which I paſſed over, either as not material, or ſo apparently true on my part, that they needed no Juſtification: Yet ſince he has inſiſted on them again, I will take Notice of the moſt material.

Sect. IX.
Concerning Bodily Worſhip.

I. *Evenhly*, Therefore he reckons it as a miſtake in *Matter of Fact*, that I affirm that *The Directory Excludes all Bodily Worſhip*, theſe he quotes as my words, *Diſ. p.* 128. and *Vind. p.* 23. tho' theſe are not the very words I uſed, yet I will ſhew there is no miſtake in them.

Firſt, Then the Compoſers of the *Directory* own no Worſhip of the Body, as requiſit in the Service of God; nor do they require any either in general or particular, and for this I urge not only their omitting it in general, but their leaving it out in theſe particular places, where if they had believed it a Duty, they could not without the greateſt unfaithfulneſs have paſſed it over. If any place of Scripture require *Bodily Worſhip*, certainly the Firſt or Second *Commandment* muſt do it; and Mr. *B.* owns (*Rem. p.* 107.) that in the Second Command, *Theſe External marks of our Inward Reverence, when we offer up our Prayers and Thankſgivings*, are required by God. But if you look into your Larger or Shorter Catechiſm, the *Aſſembly* owns no ſuch Duties to be required in thoſe Commandments, or ſo much as hints at them; Nay, in the particular and large Catalogue of Sins Forbidden in them, there is not ſo much as *Irreverence in Publick Worſhip* mentioned. Look likewiſe into the *Confeſſion of Faith*, *Chap* 1. where Religious Worſhip is handled, and there is not the leaſt mention made of *Bodily Adoration*, tho' that only be called *Worſhip*

ſhip in Scripture, as I ſhewed *Diſ. Chap.* 4. *Sect.* 1. *N.* 6. and I do not find that it is denied: Therefore if the *Aſſembly* thought it ſtill to be a Chriſtian Duty to Worſhip God with the Body, it was great unfaithfulneſs in them to omit it in all the places they treat of Religious Worſhip in their *Directory*, *Catechiſm* and *Confeſſion of Faith.*

II. *Secondly*, They poſitively forbid it in one place where it was moſt proper, that is in our firſt appearance in Gods peculiar preſence in the Publick Aſſemblies. To this Mr. *B.* anſwers (*Rem. p.* 108.) That this Order was only *Levelled againſt the Cuſtom of bowing towards* the Altar. Which is a plain miſtake, for it forbids *All Adoration or bowing themſelves towards one place or other*; therefore not only towards the Altar.

He alledges *Secondly*, *Rem. p.* 109. That the *Aſſembly* forbid *bowing ſhould be uſed by the People as they entered the Church, becauſe they ſuppoſed ſuch External Adoration ſhould be only uſed, when ſome part of Publick Worſhip was to be performed.* But I anſwer, They ſuppoſed in this that which neither they, or Mr. *B.* have proved from Scripture, or I believe ever will be proved; ſince Adoration is to be uſed in the Congregation, not only to ſignify our joyning with them in Publick Prayers or Praiſes, but likewiſe to declare that we come into the Aſſembly as Worſhipers, not Spectators, and to ſtirr up and prepare our hearts to meet our God: Every good Man comes there with a deſign to appear in God's preſence, and with expectation to receive a Bleſſing from him in the anſwer of his Prayers; and ought to have his heart affected with this, when he enters eſpecially. And tho' no Publick Worſhip is performed by the Miniſter at that time; yet he that enters ought to acknowledge by Adoration his belief of God's preſence amongſt a People met to Worſhip him, and exert an act of ſubmiſſion in his mind, and certify it with his Body, and joyn ſome ſhort Prayer or Ejaculation with it: And when I ſee a Man who comes into an Aſſembly thus proſtrating his Body, and lifting up his hands and eyes to Heaven, to ſuppoſe that this is ſeparated from *A mental Act of Worſhip*, is as uncharitable as *Elis*'s cenſure of *Hanna*, when ſhe thus prayed privately in the Tabernacle. And therefore 'tis very unreaſonable, which Mr. *B.* requires (*Rem. p.* 107.) That I ſhould prove *Adoration, Bowing the Knee, &c. When there is no other part of Worſhip offered, neither Vocal nor Mental, is yet made in Scripture a part of Worſhip.* Since I ſuppoſe Bowing our Knees in a Publick Aſſembly is a ſign of our ſence of God's preſence, and our Inward ſubmiſſion

miſſion to him, which it ſignifies and teſtifies to all preſent, tho' no other part of Publick Worſhip is at that time performed by the Miniſter. Without this Inward ſenſe, it is Hypocriſy, not Worſhip; And ſo are all our Praiſes and Prayers when ſeparated from this *Mental Devotion*, being only parts of Worſhip as they ſignify our ſenſe of God's Excellency, and our deſires to be aſſiſted by him: And if *Bowing the Knee*, *&c.* ſignify our Submiſſion and ſenſe of God's Sovereignty, as Univerſally, Certainly, and Explicitely, as Praiſes do our ſenſe of his Excellencies; the one is as proper a part of external Worſhip as the other. And indeed only bending *the Body* is called Worſhip in Scripture, as I ſhewed in my Book; and it would ſeem to me, by Mr. *B*'s. denying it to be a proper part of Worſhip, that he will not allow the Scripture to call things by their proper names: But will ſet up his Reaſons againſt the Letter of it, as I have obſerved him often to do. To conclude, That the Aſſemblies of Chriſtians are places for ſecret Prayers of each a part (when they do not interfere with any Publick Office, as well as for Publick) appears from the whole tenour of the Scripture, and the conſtant practice of the Churches of God Antient and Reformed, And that thoſe ſecret Prayers ought to be offered with Adoration, as well as the Publick, is likewiſe manifeſt. And therefore the *Directory* by forbidding Adoration at our firſt coming into Church has excluded it where it was moſt proper.

III. But Thirdly, I take it for granted that when an Old Law or Rule is laid aſide and a new ſubſtituted in the place of it, all things contained in the Old repealed Law or Order are laid aſide, which are not contained and again injoyned in the New. By which Rule the *Directory* doth plainly exclude all *Bodily Worſhip*: For in the Preface to it, we are told: that *They reſolve to lay aſide the former Liturgy with the many Rites and Ceremonies formerly uſed in the Worſhip of God, and have agreed on this following Directory for all the parts of Publick Worſhip at Ordinary and Extraordinary Times.* Here then the Liturgy with all the Rites and Ceremonies uſed formerly in the Worſhip of God are laid aſide; not only our Praiſes, Prayers, *&c.* are excluded, but all the Rites and Ceremonies with which they were performed; Such as *Kneeling*, *Standing*, *&c.* And inſtead of theſe we are obliged to no more than is ordered in the *Directory*. Prayers, Praiſes, *&c.* are there indeed Ordered, and the way of performing them preſcribed, but not a word of *Bodily Worſhip*; and therefore it is plainly

ly excluded among the other Rites and Ceremonies that are laid aſide.

IV. All that Mr. *B.* alledges to prove that this Bodily Adoration is required by the *Directory* is (*Rem. p.* 109.) that it *requires* ſuch as come into the Congregation after Publick Worſhip is begun, *Not to betake themſelves to their private Devotions, but Reverently to compoſe themſelves to joyn with the Aſſembly in that Ordinance of God, that is then in hand; which can import no leſs than putting themſelves into a Bodily Poſture, moſt ſutable to that Ordinance.* But I anſwer, This paſſage imports no ſuch thing: The *Aſſembly* has no where explained Reverence in this ſenſe, or given the leaſt reaſon to believe that they thought one poſture more ſutable to one Ordinance than another, except *Sitting at the Lords-Supper*: Which poſture they ſeem to approve thro' the whole Service; for they require thoſe that come in *To take their Seats or Places*; which in common acceptation is to ſit down, and they never require them to riſe. It was therefore incumbent on Mr. *B.* to prove that by *Joyning Reverently* in Prayers or Thankſgiving (for Example) is meant *Standing* or *Kneeling* at them, or elſe this is no Vindication of the *Directory*.

But Secondly, We are not left to gueſs what is meant by *Joyning Reverently in the Ordinance then in hand*; The Sentence immediately going before explains it, where the *Aſſembly* tells how the people are to *Joyn in Publick Worſhip, even by forbearing to read any thing —— Abſtaining from private Whiſperings, Conferences, Salutations, or doing Reverence to any Perſons —— From all gazing, ſleeping, and other indecent behaviour which may diſturb the Miniſter or People* ——. This is the way they are to joyn in the Service of God. But not one word of putting themſelves into a *Bodily Poſture* moſt ſutable to the Ordinance that is in hand. It is plain therefore, as I ſaid before, that they excluded theſe when they laid aſide the many Rites and Ceremonies uſed formerly in the Worſhip of God, and never reſtored them.

V. Let me add further, that *Reverence* and *Worſhip* are very different things: We ought to behave our ſelves *Reverently* to all our Betters, and at all times: But *Worſhip* is peculiarly to our Superiours, who have power over us. And as the things are different, ſo there are different outward Acts that expreſs them, and neither Your *Directory*, *Confeſſion of Faith*, or *Catechiſm*, or any other Authentick Rule that I know of amongſt you, require any one viſible Act peculiar to Worſhip in Your *Aſſemblies*. Nor do I ſee by what

Authority your Miniſters can exact it from their People, where they pretend to Conform to the *Directory*; nor can it be pretended that the Compoſers of it forgot this: For it is manifeſt that they remembred it ſo far as to forbid all Adoration, where it was moſt proper, that is at our coming into the Aſſembly, and never require nor allow it any where after.

VI. *Thirdly*, What I have ſaid concerning the ſenſe of the *Aſſembly* that Compoſed your *Directory* is agreable to the Notion Dr. *Twiſs* their Chairman had of this Matter; as appears from his Letter directed to Mr. *Mede*, dated *July* 27, 1635. 'Tis the 59 in the Collection: In which he gives this cenſure of Bodily Worſhip, *The Lord requires the true Worſhipers ſhould Worſhip him in Spirit and Truth in diſtinction from Worſhiping him either at* Jeruſalem, *or in the Mount the Woman ſpake of, but as to the outward geſtures, I doubt I ſhall prove a Novice as long as I breath, and we affect not to make Oſtentation of our Devotion in the face of the World; the rather becauſe thereby we draw upon our ſelves the cenſure of Hypocriſy; And ſometimes if a Man lift up his eyes he is cenſured as a P. I confeſs there is no outward geſture of Devotion which may not be as handſomly performed by as carnal a heart as breaths.* And in his thirteenth Letter, being the ſeventieth in the foremention'd Collection, he adds, *And as for outward Complements, nothing more pleaſes a Natural Man in Religious Worſhip, and he finds himſelf apt enough in it, yea, far more apt than he who knowing and conſidering that God is a Spirit, and they that Worſhip him muſt Worſhip him in Spirit, are moſt carefull for the performance thereof; Whereupon while their minds are intent they find themſelves not ſo free for outward Complements; the care whereof is apt to cauſe avocation and diſturbance in that unum neceſſarium.* Hence in the ſame Letter he blames himſelf for being prevailed with to riſe up at the ſolemn Glory given to the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*, and commends one that could never be perſwaded to it.

Thus you ſee how the *Prolocutor* of the Aſſembly ridicules Outward Worſhip, under the Names of Outward Poſtures and Complements: You find himſelf likewiſe alledging, in oppoſition to it, our Saviours Command of *Worſhiping in Spirit*, *Jo.* 4. 24. And the very ſame Arguments that I mentioned, and Anſwered in my Diſcourſe, *Chap.* 4. *Sect.* 3. plainly intimating withal, that it is a piece of Oſtentation to uſe theſe Acts of *Bodily Worſhip*, a ſign of a carnal heart to be pleaſed with them, and to neglect them a ſign of an heart intent on God's Spiritual

Spiritual Service. Yet Mr. *B.* gives me very hard words for Anſwering theſe Arguments, alledging (*Rem. p.* 125.) That he never heard any Diſſenter alledge ſuch *triffling reaſons* —— That *I framed them my ſelf*; and intimates that few can be of ſo *Sottiſh an Opinion*: And yet you ſee the Chairman of Your Aſſembly offered theſe Reaſons, and Mr. *Mede* anſwered them 60 Years ago, as *triffling* and *ſottiſh* as they are in Mr. *B*'s Account: And perhaps his declaring himſelf of theſe, and other as odd Opinions was one reaſon made the Parliament name him for Chairman. I wiſh he had not influenced them to lay aſide all Bodily Worſhip in the Service of God.

VII. *Fourthly*, The Directory Excludes *Bodily Worſhip* by impoſing ſitting at the whole Office of the Adminiſtration of the Holy Sacrament, even at thoſe Prayers and Thankſgivings, that are moſt properly Chriſtian, and peculiar to the compleat Members of Chriſt's Church. The words of the *Directory* are theſe, *The Table being decently covered, and ſo conveniently placed, that the Communicants may ſit about it, or at it, the Miniſter is to begin the action, with ſanctifying and bleſſing the Elements.* Here you ſee the Communicants are to ſit about the Table, or at it, whilſt the Miniſter begins the Bleſſing and Thankſgiving. Mr. *B* replies two things to this (*Rem. p.* 113.) Firſt, That Sitting during the time of Receiving the Elements is ſuppoſed, *tho' not enjoyned by the Directory*. But *Suppoſing* in this Caſe is *Enjoyning*; otherwiſe our Liturgy doth not enjoyn *Kneeling* in the Act of Receiving. For the words of it are, that the Miniſter ſhall deliver the Elements to the People *into their hands, all meekly kneeling*. This (according to Mr. *B.*) only *Suppoſes* the People to *Kneel*, but doth not enjoyn it; But it is manifeſt that in theſe Caſes to ſuppoſe that People Sit or Stand is Equivalent to Impoſing, becauſe if they do not ſit or ſtand they do not conform to the Order.

But Secondly, He alledges that this imports *No more than that the Table muſt be placed, that the Communicants may ſit about it, but that they muſt actually ſit during the Bleſſing or Thankſgiving is no where affirmed, much leſs impoſed.* But I anſwer, It is as much ſuppoſed, and conſequently enjoyned, that they ſhould ſit during the whole Action, as during the Receiving: That they muſt ſit ſometime is plain; The Queſtion is, when? All indifferent Perſons will underſtand it to be at that time where it is mentioned; that is before the Miniſter begin the Action. And the whole Directory ſuppoſes both Miniſter and People in the ſame Poſture throughout, and gives no Order for altering

altering it when they come to diſtribution or receiving; which they would in all reaſon have done if they had meant that they ſhould bleſs and give Thanks in one poſture, and receive in another.

Let me add, that the Precedent and Practice they had before them was contrary to Mr. *B*'s. Interpretation; I mean the Church of *Scotland*: The Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Government of which, they had ſworn to preſerve in their Covenant. Now in the Liturgy of that Church, which is plainly their Precedent in this part of the *Directory* (as any one will ſee by comparing them) the Order is conceived thus, *The Exhortation ended the Miniſter cometh down from the Pulpit, and ſitteth at the Table, every Man and Woman likewiſe taking their Places as occaſion beſt ſerveth; then he taketh Bread and giveth thanks*, and after all, *the Action thus ended, the People ſing the* 103 *Pſalm, or ſome other of Thankſgiving; which ended, one of the Bleſſings before-mentioned is recited, and ſo they riſe from the Table.* Here is Sitting Enjoyned throughout. Thus you have underſtood the *Directory* hitherto; and thus your People have practiſed to this Day: And in this the *Aſſembly* were ſworn to preſerve you. And this I did ſay, and muſt ſay, hardens you againſt *Reverence in the other parts of the Worſhip of God.* For if Sitting be a ſutable poſture for offering up the moſt ſolemn Prayers, Thankſgiving and Praiſes to God, and ſuch as are peculiar to Our Religion as Chriſtians, they certainly are ſutable to all others. And yet this the Church of *Scotland* and *Aſſembly* have determined to be ſutable. And therefore Mr. *B.* is very unreaſonable when he aſſerts (*Vind.* p. 31.) That *He is no more obliged to defend any particular Perſons in that poſture, that indulge it out of Sloth, than I am to defend the toying or laughing that is too often uſed in our Church.* This he repeats out of his *Remarks*, but the caſe is not Parallel.

For Firſt, We have particular Canons againſt all ſuch Behaviour, Namely, the Seventh that forbids *Any Perſon to be otherwiſe at ſuch times buſied then in quiet attendance to hear, mark, and underſtand that which is read, &c.* And the 88*th*, which requires the Church-Wardens, *&c.* to ſee, *That none walk, talk, or ſtand idle in the Church-Yard, or Porch*; much more in the Church. And the 91*ſt.* has theſe words, *They ſhall alſo ſee, that in every meeting of the Congregation, peace be well kept; and that none behave themſelves rudely, or diſorderly in the Church. And to that end, they ſhall warn the people, that they bring not with them to the Church, Dogs, Hawks with Bells, or Children*

which

which are not ſo nurtured, as they can be kept quiet in their ſeats, without running up and down. Neither ſhall they ſuffer any perſon to diſturb the Service or Sermon, either by untimely ringing of Bells, or by walking, talking, aughing, or any other noiſe, which may hinder the Miniſter, or offend the People. And the names of all ſuch as offend in this kind, they ſhall truly and perſonally preſent in the Ordinaries Viſitations. Till he ſhew as expreſs a Rule againſt ſitting at prayers in the Directory, he and all that own that Directory are concerned in this charge.

But *Secondly*, It is very uncharitable, and without ground, to inſinuate that *toying or laughing*, is as univerſally practis'd with us as ſitting with you. I have been in more Churches than Mr *B* and I muſt profeſs that I have generally obſerved the people behave themſelves with reverence and devotion and I do not believe that any Church in the Kingdom can be juſtly charged with Irreverence of this kind, any more than your Meetings, except perhaps one ; and that is not becauſe thoſe that do it there are not admoniſhed of their Duty, but becauſe they are too bigg to be Corrected.

I have not ſaid this to encourage you in your Irreverence, but to ſhew you the Unreaſonableneſs of it, and to convince you of the Weakneſs or Unfaithfulneſs of the Guides your Party followed when they left our Church, of whom your Advocate is aſhamed, and whom he wou'd fain excuſe by denying plain Matters of Fact : As for me, I do aſſure you I ſhould be much better pleaſed to find I was miſtaken in your Principles and Practices, then that the whole Body of you ſhould be guilty of ſuch an Irregularity ; and therefore if I had obſerved that you had Reformed effectually theſe abuſes, I ſhould not have troubled my ſelf with a Vindication ; for my deſign was not to Accuſe but Reform you : yet I thank God my endeavours have not altogether proved unſucceſsful upon you, even in this point.

VIII. Mr. *B.* affirms (*Rem. p.* 111.) That your Miniſters *frequently in their Diſcourſes to their people* recommend *Standing* or *Kneeling* in their publick Prayers, and *p.* 112. That they have *Faithfully declared to their people their diſlike* of Sitting. Now pray let me give you this eaſy Teſt to diſtinguiſh your Faithful Miniſters from the Unfaithful; Thoſe of them that have frequently and heartily reproved you for Sitting at your publick Prayers, before my Book appeared, count them in this point Faithful Miniſters of the Goſpel ; and thoſe that have not done ſo, reckon them, as they truly are, Unfaithful and conniving Shepherds. And take heed how you truſt them in other

caſes. I thank God for it, that by all I can learn, my Book has done more to reform this *Unſeemly Practice*, as Mr. *B.* himſelf calls it (*Rem. p.* 112.) amongſt you, than all your Miniſters theſe 50 years; and plainly ſhews that they need ſome inſpection to mind them of their Duty.

Sect. X.

Concerning the practice of Bodily Reverence by Diſſenters.

I. AN Eighth Matter of Fact with which Mr. *B.* anew charges me, (*Vind. p.* 23.) is, That I affirm that the *Diſſenters are Taught that external poſtures of Bodily Worſhip may in no caſe be practiſed*; for which he quotes my Diſcourſe, *p.* 137. I wiſh that Mr. *B.* while he taxes me for Accuſing you Unjuſtly, and Miſrepreſenting you, were careful of avoiding ſuch dealings toward others: If you look into the place quoted, you will neither find the Words nor Senſe of what he alledges againſt me; my Words are, *That in caſe of Neceſſity we think* our Outward Performances *may be lawfully omitted, but you are Taught that in no caſe they may be lawfully Practiſed; You are Taught rather to ſtay at home and not to Worſhip God at all publickly, than to conform in Outward Geſtures or Circumſtances.* In which Words it is plain, *Firſt*, That I addreſs my ſelf to you in particular, and not to Diſſenters in general, as he repreſents me. *Secondly*, It is evident I ſpake here of the Outward Geſtures and Circumſtances to which our Church requires you to conform, in order to joyn in her Publick Worſhip; and not of all *External poſtures of Bodily Worſhip*: And it is too ſad a Truth, that above Twenty Thouſand of you in this Dioceſs refrain and have refrained every Lord's-day from all Publick Worſhip for many Years, rather than joyn in theſe, and that you have counted our Standing, Kneeling, *&c.* Idolatrous. Heretofore appears not only from your Practice and Profeſſion, but from your Authors. Witneſs, *The Reaſons for which the Service-Book urged upon* Scotland, *ought to be refuſed, Printed* 1683, in which—— The *Third* Reaſon is, becauſe it hath *a number of Popiſh, Superſtitious and Idolatrous Ceremonies*; amongſt which are reckoned, *the Prieſt's Standing, Kneeling, Turning to the People*, and *the Peoples Standing at Goſpels, at Gloria Patri*, &c. *Creeds, their Anſwering the Miniſter and many ſuch like in number above Fifty.*

Theſe unchriſtian and unjuſt cenſures are ſtill in many of your minds.

minds, & for ought I find they are the chief objections you have againſt our Service; and I beſeech God in his Mercy to grant that either my Reaſons, or Mr. *B*'s Conceſſions may remove them, ſo that we may hear no more from you of the Idolatry, Superſtition or Popery of our Miniſters Kneeling at their Prayers, or ſtanding at their Bleſſings; or of our Peoples Kneeling at their Confeſſions of Sins, at their Prayers and Communions, or Standing at their Praiſes, Thankſgivings, Profeſſions of Faith, and other parts of our Service that require a more ſolemn attention and concern.

Sect. XI.

Concerning the Praiſes of God.

I. I Shall add a Ninth *Matter of Fact*, that has relation to the ſame Affair, and that is concerning your *praiſing God*; Mr. *B.* alledges (*Vind. p.* 23.) theſe as my words, and puts them, as ſuch, in Italian Characters, That *You have no other way of Praiſing God but by ſinging a Verſe or two of a Pſalm.* And quotes my *Diſcourſe p.* 24. for them; but if you look into the place you will find that theſe are neither my words nor ſenſe: I am there only comparing your uſe of Pſalms and Hymns in the Praiſes of God, with ours; and I obſerved that our *Church Praiſes God every Day with five or ſix Pſalms, beſides other Hymns— Whereas you only Praiſe him in a piece of a Pſalm of a few Verſes.* A thing ſo notoriouſly true, that without perverting the words, 'tis impoſſible to find any Exception againſt them.

He objects indeed that your *Directory* preſcribes Extemporary *Thankſgivings*, and ſpends many pages in his *Remarks* about them: But I anſwer, *Thankſgivings* and *Praiſes* are different things, tho' they commonly go together, and your *Extempory Thankſgivings* are reckoned in Your *Directory* under the head of *Prayers*: The Title under which they are preſcribed is that *Of publick prayer after Sermon*, the Rule is, *The Sermon being ended the Miniſter ſhall give Thanks, &c.* And then *the* Prayer *ended let a Pſalm be ſung* I had no intention to deny theſe, but reckoned them, as your *Directory* doth, with your Prayers: Which gives no other Rule for the Praiſes of God but under the head of *ſinging Pſalms*; the words there are, *It is the duty of Chriſtians to praiſe God by ſinging of Pſalms*: the only Rule for the *Praiſes* of God in the whole *Directory*. Properly ſpeaking, *Pſalms* and

and *Hymns* are the Scripture way of praiſing God, tho' in a large Senſe we praiſe him by our Confeſſions of Sins and Faith, and by our Prayers, as well as by our Thankſgivings.

Sect. XII.

Concerning the Rule of Humane Prudence.

I. A Tenth *Matter of Fact* is concerning the Rule of *Humane Prudence*, that we find, *Rem. p.* 7. and 9. he Charges me, *Vind. p.* 28. with *Miſtaking that Rule, and ſuppoſing that he denied that God had given us any particular Directions at all in Reference to the modes of Worſhip.* But I muſt declare I neither did nor intended to aſcribe any ſuch Opinion to him; I knew very well that he owned many ſuch, but he poſitively affirmed, *Rem. p.* 7, That *tho' God has commanded publick Prayer, Praiſe, Hearing, Celebration of the Lord's Supper*, &c. *Yet at what time or place we ſhall aſſemble in, in what order theſe parts of Worſhip ſhall be performed, what particular devout poſture we ſhall uſe among ſeveral equally expreſſive of our Religious Reverence, what Tranſlation of the Bible or Verſion of the Pſalms we ſhall chuſe, what portion of the Scripture ſhall be Read, Explained and Applied, what utenſils ſhall be employed in the Celebration of the Sacraments; and a multitude of ſuch Circumſtances and Modes of that kind, are left to Human determination; only therein the General Rules of Scripture muſt be regarded.* Now tho' Mr. *B.* in other Matters allows particular directions for the *Modes of Worſhip*, as he calls them, yet it is plain in theſe of *Time, Place, Poſtures, Tranſlations, Order and Circumſtances*, he allows no Particular Directions in Scripture, by which we are obliged, but only *General Rules*. Againſt this I Argued in my *Admonition*, and ſhewed that God had not only given us General Rules for theſe Matters, but likewiſe many Particular Directions and Examples concerning each of them; indeed ſo many, that if we diligently attend and mind the Conſequences of them, and apply them to like Caſes, we may have ſufficient Direction from Scripture to Order our Worſhip in each of theſe reſpects, and that it is a great Preſumption to lay aſide theſe Particular Directions and Examples, and to ſubſtitute other in their ſtead, becauſe our own *Prudence* judges them more for Edification.

II. As for Example, The New Teſtament ſhews us that there was a Tranſlation of the Pſalms in Proſe, and it doth not appear that either our Saviour or his Apoſtles uſed any other Tranſlation, or the

the Church of God for 1500 Years: But Mr. *B.* tells us, *Vind.* p 29 That the *Command which obliges Christian Churches to ſing Pſalms, neceſſarily obliges us to turn 'em in ſuch ſort of Meetre and Verſe as will beſt accommodate them to be ſung by the People.* Now this I ſay is directly to ſet up the Determination of our own *Prudence* againſt Scripture Precedent, and to accuſe Chriſt, his Apoſtles and the Church of God of not having done that which the Command of God obliged them neceſſarily to do; ſince it doth not appear that they ever Tranſlated the Pſalms into any ſort of Verſe to accommodate the People; but plainly ſuppoſed they might ſing them very well in Proſe, as they found them Tranſlated to their hands by the Seventy Interpreters. They are in no better Meetre in the Greek, Latin, Syriack, or in any other antient Tranſlation uſed by the Church of God, than in the Common-Prayer-Book. Yet the generality of thoſe that uſed theſe Tranſlations were not excluded from Singing them according to God's Command, nor are they with us: And indeed if people were not prejudiced againſt them by ſuch falſe reaſonings as Mr. *B.* offers, it is eaſier to ſing them, and underſtand them when ſung by others, in our way (which is the Antient Chriſtian Method) than when ſung according to the New Meetre Tunes.

As to the Original Hebrew Pſalms I knew very well that Learned Men had diſputed much about them: That ſome have endeavoured to find meaſure in them, others rhime; but after all they come generally to that reſult which I gave you, *Diſ. Chap.* 1. *Sect.* 1. *N.* 3. *That it is evident they are poetical, but the poetry of them conſiſts rather in the ſtile or manner of expreſſion than in any certain meaſures or verſes.* And the ſame is obſerved in the Hymns and Songs of the New Teſtament; Such as thoſe of *Zacharias* and the bleſſed Virgin: Which are plainly Poetical Compoſures, and as much Hymns as any of *Davids* Pſalms, and as fit to be ſung. And more particularly thoſe two Songs which the Church is repreſented Singing in the *Rev. Chap.* 9. and *Chap.* 15. which are as much Verſe in the Engliſh as in the Original.

He alledges indeed *Vind.* p 29. That the *Pſalms of David were wrote in ſuch ſort of Meetre and Verſe as was then uſed.* But this is more then any one knows, and no ways concern us, ſince the Tranſlation of them which we find under the New Teſtament, and the Hymns and Songs Recorded in it, are not in that ſort of Verſe or Meetre, or Poetry that was then uſed in the World, but in ſuch as we find in

the Old Teſtament; and ſuch as our Church ſtill retains in our Hymns and Pſalms: Nor has ſhe ever allowed by any Publick Act the Meetre Pſalms; much leſs that they ſhould juſtle out the Scripture way of uſing them in Proſe.

III. *Secondly*, The Scripture directs us to uſe all the ways of offering up Pſalms to God that were then common.

Firſt, By Singing them together; So did *Moſes* and the Children of *Iſrael*, *Ex.* 15.

Secondly, *By Courſes*; So did the Prieſts and Levits, *Ezra* 3. 11.

Thirdly, By a ſelect Quire; So was the cuſtom in the Temple.

Fourthly, By ones Singing, and the reſt joyning with him in their minds, and attending for their Edification and Comfort. So the Prophets did that had inſpired Pſalms, 1 *Cor.* 14. 26. For it is not conceiveable how the Congregation could joyn their voices in a Pſalm that was either inſpired in the place, or brought prepared by the Prophet, ſince we all agree that there was no Reading a line, as with us, and then Singing it.

Fifthly, By ſpeaking or reciting Pſalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs.

Sixthly, By plain Singing them. And

Seventhly, By playing to them; So *Eph.* 5. 19. *Speaking to your ſelves in Pſalms and Hymns and Spiritual Songs, Singing and making Melody in your Heart to the Lord.* The word we render *making melody*, is literally (as I have formerly obſerv'd) Singing or Playing to an Inſtrument: And theſe three *Speaking*, *Singing* and *Playing*, are litterally the ways Men uſed their Hymns, Poems and Songs: And the Apoſtle directs us to uſe our Pſalms all theſe ways, as we have occaſion; adding that we muſt uſe them to the Lord only, and with grace in our Hearts.

Theſe are the Precedents and Directions the Scriptures give us for the uſe of our Pſalms; and our Church retains them all on occaſions. And to pretend that all or any of theſe are impractical, diſorderly, or contrary to Edification, I take to be a great preſumption, and this I ſuppoſe to be your Caſe, and Mr. *B*'s.

He aſſerts, *Rem. p.* 13. That the *New Teſtament recommends no other uſe of Pſalms but Singing*, and quotes, *Eph.* 5. 19. to prove it; whereas the very letter of the place recommends *Speaking* them, and *Playing* to them, as well as Singing them. And ſo Proteſtant Interpreters, both our own and Strangers, underſtand it.

Secondly,

Secondly, You and he have laid aſide all theſe ways Precedented in Scripture, and ſubſtituted inſtead of them one that is not yet a hundred year old, peculiar to theſe Countries, and not commonly uſed in other Singing; I mean reading a line, and the people Singing it after; which Mr. *B.* confeſſes, *Remarks* p. 28. to be indeed *A defect, but ſuch as we muſt be forced to condeſcend to, unleſs we could prevail with all our People to get Pſalm Books, and learn to read, or to commit 'em to memory*: As if all the poor Chriſtians in the Apoſtles time had had Pſalm Books; or cou'd have read; or had the Pſalms by heart; or as if our Neighbour Reformed Churches were in a better Caſe in this point than we: But this is plainly to ſuppoſe that the Apoſtles and the Church of God were ignorant of this neceſſary means of Edifying the People till a few years ago; and that the Scripture failed to give us Direction what we are to do with the Pſalms when the people want Books, cannot read, or have them not by heart: Which has ever been the Caſe of many ſince they were firſt Sung. But the ſame Scripture that commands us to do all things for Edification, commands us likewiſe to uſe the Pſalms as I have ſhewed, and never preſcribes or mentions the defective way uſed by you; and therefore we may be ſure Singing the Pſalms by a Choir, Reading them by Courſes, and Playing to them are not contrary to Edification: And to oppoſe the Determinations of *Human Prudence* to theſe particular Precedents, is to make the Word of God of none effect by your Tradition: And is what I blame in You and Mr. *B.* as Teaching your own Inventions. I poſitively declared that I did not condemn Singing Meetre-Pſalms as unlawful, but only your caſting out the Proſe intirely in your publick praiſes of God, and preferring the Meetre meerly on the ſtrength of our own prudential Determinations; as more edifying and fitter for a Congregation. This I took to be a preferring your own reaſon or Tradition to the Word of God.

IV. The ſame I ſay concerning Extemporary Prayer: I never denied but Extemporary Prayers may be lawful, nay, neceſſary on Extraordinary Occaſions, when a man has not a Form ready, or time to Compoſe one. I granted, that in this caſe, we may *Depend on the aſſiſtance of God's Spirit, as in all other caſes of Neceſſity; or at leaſt hope for pardon, of courſe, to our Infirmities.*

But I ſhewed, *Diſ. Chap.* 2. *Sect.* 3. *N.* 3. That God had Commanded Forms of Prayer, both to Prieſts and People, in the Old and New Teſtament: That the Church of the Jews uſe a Form of Prayer

in

in their Publick Ordinary Service; that the Pſalms of *David* are a Collection of ſuch Forms, and ſo are called, *Pſal.* 72. 20. And it doth not appear that any other Publick Prayers were ordinarily uſed in the Temple; and that we have many Precedents of ſuch. I add now that ſuch Prayers are ſufficient to expreſs all our Deſires to God on Ordinary Publick Occaſions, which are conſtantly the ſame; and if any thing Extraordinary happen, the Church may provide a Form for it; it being unreaſonable that it ſhould be left to every private Miniſter to impoſe what Confeſſion or Petitions he pleaſes on the people; or at leaſt, in ſuch a ſolemn affair as Uttering to God the Senſe of a Nation, or even of a Congregation. A Miniſter ought to reduce what he intends to ſay, into Form, and conſider it well before-hand, that he may be ſure that the Words are fit and proper for the Publick, as well as the Matter.

I ſhewed further, That there is no Promiſe in Scripture to furniſh us with Words without this care; And that the *Spirit of Prayer*, promiſed in Scripture, doth not include any ſuch Gift, either to Miniſter or people: and therefore to lay aſide Prayers by a Form, in our Ordinary Publick Occaſions (which are ſtill the ſame) is plainly to prefer our own Inventions to Scripture Precedents, And our Prudential Application of a General Rule, to the method preſcribed in ſeveral particular caſes under that General Rule by God himſelf. I grant Praying Extemporarily, and Prayer by a Form are different ways of Worſhiping God, or *Modes*; to uſe Mr. *B*'s. phraſe (who commonly, in theſe caſes, ſhelters himſelf in ſome new difficult Word, which many of you do not underſtand.) But I ſay, We have only Precedents for one of theſe ways in Scripture, in performing of Publick Prayers in an Ordinary Settled Congregation; and therefore for you to lay aſide this way, (as you do in your moſt Publick and Ordinary Addreſſes) for Extemporary Prayers, is to prefer your own Wiſdom to God's. If the thing it ſelf had been feaſible, the method of Anſwering this Argument againſt Extemporary Prayer was eaſy, nor was there any need of that long Diſcourſe you find in Mr. *B*'s. Remarks, or the hard Words he gives me about it. The whole difficulty incumbent on him, was to ſhew ſome Command of God in Scripture, requiring us to Worſhip, or Pray to him in a Conceived, or Unpremeditated, or *Free*-prayer, as he calls it; or ſome Example in a Settled, Ordinary Congregation, where it was practiſed. Till he do this, his Arguments for the Uſefulneſs of ſuch Prayers, and

and for their Neceſſity, drawn from their being more *Moving* and more *Edifying* then Forms, are only oppoſing his own experience to the Precedents of Holy Scripture; And it ſeems to me that only the Itching-Ears of People who love Novelty and Variety give ground for ſuch Surmiſes: But theſe are Vices againſt which they ought to be Cautioned; not to be Cheriſhed and Encouraged in them, as Mr. *B.* does, *Rem. p.* 163. ſince they are apt to cheat men with a falſe devotion, and are not neceſſary to a true one; of which, had Mr. *B.* been throughly ſenſible, I conceive he would not have given me ſuch very hard Words for interpreting an *Itching Ear*, to be an Ear that loves them; or affirmed (as he does *Rem. p.* 101.) That no *Expoſitor before me, ever dream'd* of ſuch a Senſe of them. I wiſh he wou'd conſult a few more Expoſitors before he peremtorily determine concerning the Senſe of Scriptures: He might have found *Eſtius*, *Alapide* and *Calvin*, noted Commentators, concurr in this Senſe with me, and the Context, as well as the Words, where they are uſed, enforce it, 2 *Tim.* 43. *For the time will come, when they will not endure ſound Doctrine; but after their own Luſts, heap up to themſelves Teachers, having Itching Ears.* Which words, plainly give two Reaſons that move people to heap up Teachers to themſelves, their *Luſts* and their *Itching Ears*: But Mr. *B.* wou'd perſwade us that the Apoſtle meant only one of them; whereas the Experience of all Ages has found, that the deſire of Novelty and Variety, has made men ready to entertain Fables and Falſe Doctrines, as well as their *Wanton Fancies or Various Inclinations*, as he alledges; If by *Wanton Fancies* he meant any thing elſe then a Fancy, that loves Novelty and Variety; and if the ſame be meant by it, then he had no reaſon to abuſe me for a whole Page together, for interpreting the words in that Senſe, ſince he himſelf doth the ſame.

Mr. *B.* I confeſs, offers ſome Scripture Precedents for Extemporary Prayer in publick, *Rem. p.* 35. namely, *Solomons*, 1 *Kings* 8. 22. *Aſas* 2 *Chron.* 14. 11. *Jehoſaphats*, 2 *Chron.* 20. 5. *Hezekias*, *Iſa.* 36 15. 16. *Ezras*, *Chap.* 9. 5. *Nehemiahs*, *Chap.* 9. 5. But theſe are not to the purpoſe; they are all of them on Extraordinary Occaſions, and in Extraordinary Aſſemblies, in which 'tis granted that Extemporary Prayers may be neceſſary. *Secondly*, They are generally the particular Prayers of the men that offered them, and not of the Aſſembly; ſuch is *Solomons*, *Hezekiahs* and *Ezra's*. *Thirdly*, It doth not appear but they were all Forms Written and Prepared before-

hand. I take it for granted, That the Confeſſion in *Neh.* 9. was ſo, for eight Levites repeated it, the People ſtanding, as appears by the Fifth Verſe, *Then the Levites Jeſhua and Cadmiel, Bani, Haſhabniah, Sherebijah, Hodijah, Shebaniah, ſaid ſtand up and bleſs the Lord your God for ever and ever.* And ſo they go on with the Confeſſion, and it is like the People joyned their Voices alſo, for they uſed to joyn in the Bleſſings and Praiſes of God, to do which the Levites now invite them: And in the latter end of the Confeſſion it is ſaid, *V.* 18. becauſe of all this, *We make a ſure Covenant and Write it.* This Confeſſion is then plainly the Preface to that Covenant, and therefore theſe are no *clear Inſtances* (as he alledges) or Precedents for Extemporary Prayers in an Ordinary Settled Congregation; much leſs is there any Command for ſuch: Whereas the Precedents for Forms of Prayer are expreſs, and the Command to uſe the Lord's-prayer in particular, Litteral, *Lu.* 11. 2. *When you pray, ſay Our Father*; to which Mr. *B*'s Interpretation is a Contradiction; when you pray you need not ſay Our Father, *&c.* either in Ordinary Publick Addreſſes to God, or Occaſional.

V. Let me obſerve further that tho' Mr. *B* gives me ſuch hard words for not diſtinguiſhing between the *Spirit of Prayer* and the *Gift*, *Rem. p* 60. Yet he doth not bring one place of Scripture where they are diſtinguiſhed: It was directly my buſineſs to ſhew that there was no ſuch Ordinary *Gift*, without the help of Forms, neceſſary, or promiſed, either to the Children of God, or (which is the ſame thing as Mr. *B.* now ſtates it, *Rem. p.* 59.) to all Miniſters or private Chriſtians, *In the diligent uſe of ſuch helps as they are furniſhed with, and frequent exerciſing themſelves in this excellent duty.* This is a point ſo material, that we ought to have plain Scripture for it, and a clear promiſe that God will give this *Gift* to us on all occaſions ordinary and extraordinary without the help of Forms, if we uſe the means, endeavour it heartily, and exerciſe our ſelves in it. But Mr. *B.* has not produced one particular, much leſs clear promiſe to this purpoſe; only he argues the conveniences of it from general Rules, which ſignify nothing when duly examined; neither ought to be put in the ballance with our Saviours Command and Scripture Precedents: And therefore I had good reaſon to ſuppoſe that Mr. *B.* ſet up his Rule of *Human Prudence* to the excluſion of any particular Rule or Precedent in Scripture in theſe Duties he mentioned: Nay, I had good warrant to believe that he allows a diſpenſing Pow-

er

er even againſt expreſs Scripture Rules and Precedents, when his *Human Prudence* judges them contray to Edification: He aſſerts this poſitively in the matter of *Ordination*, and I had reaſon to believe the ſame as to matter of *Worſhip*: Saith he, *Reflect. p.* 37. *Poſitive Precepts muſt always yield to Moral, and Matters of meer Order to the end of the duty ordered; and the former muſt never be pleaded againſt the latter.* This I take to be a dangerous Poſition; for it is in effect to ſay that all the particular Rules in Scripture about the Worſhip of God, and Diſcipline of his Church, ceaſe to be Obligatory on any Party of Men that think them contrary to Edification: Whereas we ought to ſuppoſe that they never are contrary to it, and therefore are never to be laid aſide; and that tho' they ſeem to us to be contrary, yet they are not, but are ſome way miſapplied; which is to be amended without Diſpenſing with them. Thus I may be aſſured that praying to God by a Form is very edifying, becauſe I find Precedents for doing ſo in Scripture; and I ought to look on it as a very corrupt *Human Prudence* that ſuggeſts the contrary. And herein, as I take it, lies the principal difference between Mr. *B.* and Me concerning this Rule; I argue that Forms of Prayer, Singing Proſe Pſalms, *&c.* are edifying, becauſe I find them uſed in Scripture; he argues that they ought not to be generally uſed, becauſe his *Human Prudence* and Obſervation finds them contrary to Edification. I muſt leave you to judge which of us pay the greateſt deference to the holy Scripture, or have the greateſt opinion of our own *Prudence*.

VI. To Conclude this head, I will deal eaſily with Mr. *B.* and allow him the Interpretation of his Rule which he now gives, and tho' he ſays, That *only the general Rules muſt be regarded*, yet I will allow he did not intend to exclude particular directions, and I will take the Rule as Mr. *Baxter* has it, from whence I ſuppoſe Mr. *F.* took it, in theſe words; (Conformity Stated, *p.* 13.) *We never held that the Scripture is a particular Rule, commanding every accident and circumſtance about God's Worſhip (but only a general Rule requiring all to be done in Love and Peace, and to Edification, and decently, &c.) in thoſe Circumſtances which muſt be ſome way determined, and God hath left to variable Humane Determinations: Such as are, Time, Place, Utenſils, Tranſlations, Sections, Metres, Tunes, Methods and Words in Preaching and Prayer, Habits, Geſtures, and many ſuch like.* This Rule is laid down in the Name of all your Party, and I hope you will ſtand by it; for it not only juſtifies our Holy Days, Communion Table,

ble, Rails, Habits, Desks, Pulpit and Fonts, as I shewed in my *Admonition*, but also our Office for the Dead: For we have a general Rule in Scripture to pray always, more especially when we meet with any loss or cause of sorrow; And I suppose our Human Prudence doth determine that the death of a Friend is a very sensible loss; that the time of his Burial is a very proper time for Prayer; and his Grave where we take our last farewell of him is a very proper place to express our hope of his Resurrection, and to thank God for that hope; which is the sum of that Office of our Church. The same may be said for the Thanksgiving of Women after Child-Birth, and indeed for every other Office appointed by our Church; and every practice even of our Reading the Apocrypha, and standing at the Gospel; the one being a gesture within the very Letter of the Rule, and as the Prudence of the Church has judged for many Ages very edifying; and the other full as warrantable as your Ministers Reading the *Covenant and Acknowledgment of Sins*, which they were ordered to do, two Lord's Days, *Oct.* 6. 1648. Nay it justifies that which we are no ways obliged to justify, tho Mr. *B.* often objects it to us, that is, bowing towards the *East*, *or Altar*, it being no Rule of our Church, or universal practice. For God has in general commanded us to Worship him with our Bodies; and it is very convenient, decent, and solemn, that the whole Congregation should bow one way; without meeting each others faces: If therefore *Human Prudence* determine that this gesture shall be used at certain times, and that it shall be towards the *East*, or Communion Table; it only does what the Rule impowers, and it fully justifies it.

The same may be said of bowing the head at the Name of *Jesus*, which yet is not required of you; there being no Rule for it in the Church of *Ireland*; and the same is obvious of all these other things Mr. *B.* excepts against, *Vind. p.* 28.

Sect. XIII.

Concerning the Third, Fourth and Fifth Canons.

I. A Tenth *Matter of Fact* is his adding and taking away from our Third, Fourth and Fifth Canons. He professes that he *cannot imagine wherein* he has added to them, *Vind. p* 33. For the determination of this I desire you to Consult the *Remarks p.* 179. and there you will find him affirming that our Fifth and Third Ca-

non

non Excommunicate *ipſo facto* all that are guilty of the Crimes mentioned in them; and intimates the ſame concerning the Fourth: But he has added theſe words *ipſo facto* out of his own head, or by inconſiderately tranſcribing Mr. *Baxter*, who indeed quotes the Third, Fourth and Fifth Engliſh Canons; but the *Iriſh* Canons which Mr. *B.* here quotes treat of different matters, and have no ſuch words in them; and yet theſe words are ſo material, that he founds his principal Arguments againſt theſe Canons on them; alledging it (*Rem. p.* 180.) as a great *abſurdity* that they Excommunicate without any other *Admonition* then what the *Canons themſelves give*; and that they *peremptorily cut off from Chriſt without perſonal warning*. and *p.* 146. That *All are denounced Excommunicated* who affirm or maintain the Doctrines condemned in thoſe Canons. Whereas thoſe Canons neither denounce any Excommunicated, nor Excommunicate any *ipſo facto*; and tho' the Crimes be very grievous, ſuch as Preaching againſt the Eſtabliſhed Worſhip in the Common-Prayer-Book; condemning our Orders; unchurching our Congregations; ſeparating from us as profane; and ſetting up Altar againſt Altar; yet the Canons do not impower the Biſhops to Excommunicate Perſons ſo guilty till they be Cited, Admoniſhed, the Fact proved, and they perſiſt impenitently in their Errors: Whereas if they were Excommunicated *ipſo facto* (as Mr. *B.* alledges there needed only Citation and a proof of the Fact, and a Declaration of the Sentence.

Sect. XIV.
Concerning His Demands.

I. BUt Eleventhly, As Mr. *B* denies that he has added to our Canons, ſo likewiſe aſſerts, *Vind. p.* 33. That he *has reviewed* all the demands he has made in his *Remarks*, and can ſee no unjuſt repreſentation in them. I do not think it proper to trouble you with an Examination of all thoſe. I will only put you in mind that I hinted at ſome of them in my *Admonition*, *p* 49. as in the fifth, where he repreſents us abſolving the *Uncenſured*; which is a very unjuſt repreſentation: For the Abſolution of the ſick is not the abſolving of the *Uncenſured*, but of one that by *A ſpecial Confeſſion of ſome weighty matter that troubles his Conſcience* has ſubmitted himſelf to the cenſure and judgment of a Miniſter.

Secondly, In the ſeventh demand he cenſures our Canons in the

matter of ſuch as are to be Ordained as very defective; which is a very unjuſt repreſentation, they being as ſtrict as the Apoſtles, 1. *Tim.* 3. and in ſuch a degree, that if duly obſerved, no inſufficient perſon can be admitted into Orders.

I will add two or three more, for I cannot go thro' all.

II. *Thirdly*, Therefore in his ſecond demand, *p.* 171. he repreſents the Authority of Biſhops to be ſo devolved on their Chancellours, as to be out of their own hands; and *humbly deſires they would endeavour to recover the ſpiritual part of it.* This is an unjuſt repreſentation, and ſhews he does not underſtand our Conſtitution, or practice, for, *Firſt*, In many Caſes the Biſhop cannot devolve his Power on his Chancellour, but muſt act himſelf. *Secondly*, The Chancellour's Power doth not exclude the Biſhops in any caſe. On the contrary, he is only his Subſtitute when abſent, and his Aſſiſtant when preſent: The Biſhop may when he pleaſes ſit in his own Courts, and when he pleaſes admit what Clergy-Men he thinks proper to aſſiſt him, and diſpoſe of all things according to the Canons; He may reſerve a cauſe to his own Hearing; paſs ſentence in it according to his own Judgment; and diſmiſs or ſuſpend it; and in every ſtep act independently of his Chancellour. It is true he cannot in ſome Caſes diſpoſe of the Chancellour, or Regiſters Fees; to which (being a Lay Perquiſite) the Common Law intitles them; and it is not the Churches fault that we cannot reform it. But from this it ſufficiently appears that to repreſent our Juriſdiction as out of our hands is very unjuſt.

And here let me take notice of a moſt unjuſt Reflection Mr. *B.* has caſt on the Juriſdiction of this Dioceſs, in particular: He aſſerts, *p.* 157. *That you have very little hopes of Reformation of Manners, from either the Perſons that compoſe thoſe Courts, or from the manner of their proceedings; and hopes that I ſhould not expect that you ſhould turn Informers, to bring Griſt to our Mills.* And intimates, That we only draw people in there to make *a Prey* of them. Theſe are every one moſt unjuſt Repreſentations; and I dare appeal to the ſeveral hundreds I have had in my Court, ſince I came to this Dioceſs, for the truth of what I aſſert: I can anſwer for my ſelf and all the Officers of the Court, and dare affirm that none of them ever made a Prey of any. I ſhall only give the Chancellors account of this matter, and deſire Mr. *B.* to try if he can produce one inſtance to the contrary.

My Lord after all the tenderneſs of your Lordſhips Eccleſiaſtical Courts,

I

I am ſurpriz'd to find that Mr. B. (*in his Book againſt you*) *ſpeaks to your Lordſhip of ſuch Courts* as bring contempt on the cenſures of the Church, decreeing 'em on frivolous cauſes, in a raſh and precipitant manner, making 'em an Engine to ſqueeze the Purſes of men rather than reform their Manners, *p.* 155. as hunting for Prey, and on that ſcore drawing men into their clutches, *p.* 156. as ſcandalouſly managed: The cenſures of the Church proſtituted to ſo vile a purpoſe as that of filthy lucre, and that thereby the Temple of God is turned into a Houſe of Merchandize, *p.* 171. *This in a Book ſo full of harſh innuendo's may make ſome Readers believe that the Accounts he has from hence* (*of which he ſometimes ſpeaks*) *give him ground to talk at this rate. And ſeeing theſe things are ſaid to the Biſhop of* Derry, *and the Reformation of them deſir'd, thoſe who are ſtrangers to your Lordſhips Courts, and your Dioceſs, may be inclin'd to believe that the Juriſdiction here is managed by ſuch Harpy's as he has deſcribed; for what Courts can your Lordſhip reform but your own? and why is this objected to your Lordſhip unleſs you are ſuppoſed to be guilty? Therefore as far as this may be underſtood to relate to your Lordſhips Dioceſs* (*concerning which, properly, all the Diſpute is*) *I ſhall beg leave of your Lordſhip to offer this ſhort anſwer to it. I have never heard that any Judge of the Conſiſtory of* Derry *ſince* June 1691, *when I came firſt into this Dioceſs, receiv'd any Fees but what came through my hands; for I attended conſtantly on the Courts ſince that time* (*as Surrogate the firſt year, and Chancellor the two laſt*) *to your Lordſhips knowledge, who was duly preſent at them when you were in town: Now during theſe three Years there are, or have been, about* 200 *Perſons* (*reputed of that Perſwaſion that Mr.* B. *ſeems to vindicate*) *proceeded againſt in the Eccleſiaſtical Courts of* Derry, *preſented by the Church-Wardens, for Fornication, Adultery, Inceſt,* &c. *From all which, there has not been taken for the Judges Fees to the value of Ten Pounds. The laſt Fifteen Months I reſided in my Pariſh, Seven miles diſtant from the Court, yet attended without any Surrogate, leſt I ſhould be obliged to grant the full Fees to others which I remit often my ſelf; ſo that my many neceſſary Journies, my neglect of my own private Concerns, my ſtaying many Nights and Weeks from my own Dwelling, being conſidered, any reaſonable Perſon may compute my Gains. I ſhall not enter into any Invidious compariſon between this Management and the times of Treſbitery or Independency; but ſuppoſing that my Brethren may juſtify their Courts in the ſame manner, if the Scene of the preſent Diſpute were not laid in this See: I ſhall content my ſelf with this, That all men may hence diſcern whether our Courts*

have

have deſerved the ſevere Intimations before-mentioned, or whether Mr. B's *friends here, have been devoured as a prey,* &c. ——

Ballychelaghan, June 6. 1694. *My Lord, your Lordſhips,* &c. Robert Gourney.

To conclude, I dare affirm that all the Officers of the Court of *Derry*, have not had Forty Pound Fees from all the ſeveral hundred Criminals that have been in it ſince I came into the Dioceſs; ſo far have they been from Oppreſſing or Squeezing any: And yet I am not ſatisfied that this Mildneſs is commendable, for I find the greater part ſo loſt to all ſenſe of Goodneſs, and ſo exceedingly ſordid in their Temper, that they had rather do Penance both at Meeting and Church than pay a few Shillings; and perhaps on ſuch people, the fear of paying a little Money, would work a greater Reformation, and awaken them more then all other Endeavours.

III. *Fourthly*, He repreſents Miniſters in his Sixth Demand, *p.* 173. as depriv'd of their *Paſtoral Power* that belongs to them, and Wiſhes that Biſhops would exerciſe their Authority in concurrence with their Presbyters; and another of your Miniſters repreſents Biſhops as the ſole Paſtours of the whole Dioceſs, Mr. *Craghead p.* 145. Now all theſe are Miſrepreſentations. For *Firſt*. There are many acts of Epiſcopal Power and Authority which a Biſhop cannot exerciſe without the concurrence of his Presbyters. *Secondly*, There is not one act belonging to a Congregation, except confirming the Baptiſed (which has ever been peculiar to Biſhops) but a Presbyter, with the conſent of his Biſhop, may exerciſe it. *Thirdly*, A Presbyter has as much power in the matter of Excommunication as any Presbyterian Miniſter, ſince he can reprove, rebuke, exhort and ſuſpend from the Sacrament; which is all that any of them can do. And whereas Mr. *B.* alledges that he muſt turn Informer againſt ſuch as he ſuſpends, in the Spiritual Courts, *where they are ſure to be put to great Charges.* This is another Miſrepreſentation; For there is no ſuch neceſſity of putting into the Court ſuch Offenders, except their Sins be publick; or if they ſhould be put into it, that they ſhould be put to much Charges, except they continue impenitent, and then it is neceſſary they ſhould pay the Fees of the Office, which are very ſmall, whatever Mr. *B.* ſuggeſts, and 'tis the Offenders own fault, if they be otherwiſe, who make them ſo by their obſtinacy: To conclude, a Presbyter dance

muſt act in dependance and with conſent of his Biſhop in many things, but this doth not hinder him from being a Paſtour, joyntly with his Biſhop of the whole Dioceſs, and particularly in his own care.

IV. Let me obſerve further, That neither Presbyterians or Independents can with any reaſon object this to our Presbyters; for every Presbyterian Miniſter depends on his Brethren in theſe acts, and can neither Excommunicate or perform any other Proper Act of Government, that concerns the whole Church, without conſent of a Synod; and if his depending on a Synod in theſe Acts, doth not hinder him from eſteeming himſelf a Paſtour, why ſhou'd a Presbyter with us not count himſelf a Paſtour, ſince he has as much power alone as your Miniſters, and as much in Conjunction with his Biſhop, as yours have with a Synod? and eſpecially when it is conſidered that the preſence and conſent of a Biſhop is eaſier had than that of a Synod; and the Biſhop is obliged by known Rules and Laws to concur in thoſe things that are reaſonable, whereas generally your Matters are Arbitrary and depend on the major Votes.

As to the Congregational Miniſters, They in theſe Acts depend on the conſent of their own Congregations, in whom (according to them) the power of the Keys is Originally ſeated; and they cannot Excommunicate any without conſent of their People, which is more oppoſite to the nature of a Paſtour, than acting with the conſent of a Biſhop, and in Subordination to him; and indeed ſuch Miniſters are rather meer Servants, than Paſtours of their People: In this point therefore, Mr. *B.* has made a very unjuſt Repreſentation of our Principles and Practice.

Sect. XV.
Concerning Mr. Sq.

I. THe laſt *Matter of Fact*, of which I ſhall take notice, concerns a perſon rejected from Orders in our Church, and now a Preacher of your party. Mr. *B.* affirms that your Miniſters declare that they know of no ſuch perſon, and ſays, That *if I mean Mr.* Sq. *he declares he was never examined, as to his Learning, by us; and that moſt that know him, think, that if I reject all thoſe, of my Clergy, that*

are not Mr. Sq*'s. ſuperiors in Learning, I muſt exclude a great many of thoſe that are now in this Dioceſs.*--

You ſee how he neceſſitates me to give an account of this affair. This Gentleman whom I did not name, out of the great reſpect I had to his Relations, ſoon after the Troubles, procur'd Mr. *Robert Gage*, of this Dioceſs, to preſent him to the then Biſhop of *Rapho*, for the Order of a Deacon; the Biſhop, according to the 31 Canon, demanded a Certificate of his Degree, good Life and Converſation under the Colledge Seal; but that he neither had, nor could procure, whereupon the Biſhop refus'd him. After I came to this place he applied himſelf to me, both in perſon and by his friends; but I refuſed him and them, till ſuch time as he was publickly Examined according to the Canons: In the mean while I diſcours'd him ſeveral times, and found him unfit as to his Learning, yet wou'd not diſcourage him, but adviſed him to ſuch Books as I thought moſt fit and neceſſary for him: When the time drew near, that I intended to have an Ordination, he Petitioned to be admitted to the Publick Examination which was to precede it; I read the Petition written in his own Hand, but the Latin ſo falſe and improper, that it appeared by it, he was not Maſter of the Grammar, much leſs of the Latin Tongue. I conſulted ſome of the Clergy about him, and came to a reſolution not to admit him; but to do it in the ſofteſt way I cou'd, I diſcours'd him again, ſhewed him his Defects, and that it wou'd Expoſe him to be Examined publickly, eſpecially at the ſame time, when others were to be Examined of Parts and Learning, and therefore adviſed him to delay till ſome other time, and till he cou'd get a Certificate from the Colledge, without which I could not regularly Ordain him: He ſeemed Diſcontented, and the next thing I heard, was, that the *Sunday* after he went to the Meeting, and declared againſt the Church. This is the Truth of the matter, and I muſt declare that I never admitted any, to any Order, Benefice or Curacy, in this Dioceſs, who were not by many Degrees his Superiors in Learning, Parts and Steadineſs of Thoughts; and as to thoſe that were preferred in the Dioceſs before my coming to it, I ſuppoſe that Mr. *Sq.* himſelf will have more Modeſty then to compare himſelf with them: I muſt add that he is not the only perſon has ſerved me at this rate.

II. And from this you may obſerve,

Firſt,

First, That no people are more impatient of Diſcipline, than ſuch as would perſwade the World that they are the Great Patrons of it, and moſt Zealous for it. This Gentleman, that is now joyned with you, for purer Ordinances and Diſcipline, was ſo diſguſted by the ſtrictneſs of ours, that he left our Church.

Secondly, You may obſerve that ſome people are reſolved to be Miniſters at any rate, and when thoſe that have the Keys of the Church will not admit them they leap over the Wall.

Thirdly, You ſee by this how much Men advance their Reputation and Intereſt, by being of a Party. Here is a Gentleman that had ſo little Reputation amongſt us, for learning and ſufficiency, that he was not thought fit to be a Deacon, by two Biſhops, and ſeveral Clergy Men; And yet by joyning with you, moſt of your Party that knew him in *Dublin*, where they are beſt able to judge, prefer him to many of the Clergy of this Dioceſs. So unjuſt and partial are Men in their Judgments where their Party is concerned; and thus it has been ſince Diviſions were firſt in the Church: St. *Paul* hints at it, 2 *Cor.* 10. 12. And *Tertullian* ſpeaks to it in point, above 1400 Years ago, In his Book *De Preſcriptionibus*, where he obſerves of thoſe that divided from the Church that they Ordained *Apoſtatas noſtros ut gloria eos obligent, quia veritate non poſſunt. Nuſquam facilius proficitur quam in Caſtris Rebellium.* 'Twere too ſevere to Tranſlate theſe words; but the meaning is, that ſo a Man left the Church, he might have Reputation and Orders eaſily amongſt the divided Parties.

Fourthly, You may obſerve that it is not always Convictions of Conſcience brings Men to your Party: Here in the beginning of the week a Gentleman gave in a Petition in his own hand writing, and was earneſt to be admitted into Orders; and being put off, next *Sunday* he declares himſelf of Your Party againſt the Church. He muſt have great Charity, that will ſuppoſe this to proceed from meer Conviction of Conſcience.

Fifthly, You may obſerve, how unfit Judges the People are of the Ability and Qualifications of Men for the Miniſtry, and how eaſy it is to deceive and impoſe on them, in which I have had Experience in three or four other Caſes.

Sixthly,

Sixthly, This ſhews the miſery, and miſchief of Parties in the Church, and how impracticable they render Diſcipline. I have taken what care I cou'd to obviate this; and have refus'd to admit ſome that were driven out of *Scotland* by the fury of the Rabble, till they brought a Certificate from their Adverſaries, of their Lives and Converſations; and that they had no other Exception againſt them, except their not complying with the Church Government there Eſtabliſhed. Whether your Party take the ſame Meaſures they know beſt that admitted Mr. *Sq.* to Preach.

Sect. XVI.

Perſonal Vindication.

I. THere is one thing further that I am obliged to take Notice of, rather indeed to comply with the ſuggeſtions of my Friends, than that I judge it neceſſary, or ſo much as convenient. It concerns my own Perſon, and not the Cauſe; and I reckon where-ever a man that pretends to anſwer a Book meddles with the Perſon or Perſonal Affairs of his Adverſary, it is a plain Confeſſion that he has the worſt of the *Argument*, and that he is forced to make up with ſlight and art what is wanting in point of reaſon. Yet this Mr. *B.* has done in ſeveral places of his Remarks, and has employ'd moſt of thoſe arts that popular Lawyers make uſe of to carry their Clients Cauſe at the Barr, but are very improper to be uſed by the *Advocates* of Truth, who ought to have no view but the glory of God, the advancement of his true Worſhip, and the Peace and Unity of his Church. I am conſcious to my ſelf that I had no other aim in the writing my Book; and I hope I may ſay that the deep concern I had for the due Obſervation of the Worſhip of God, and the danger of ſuch as neglect it, did influence every Sentence in it. I had before me the great Obligation that lay on me as a Paſtour and Father in the Church, even the great and ſolemn Oath of God, made in my Ordination. I remembred that the trueſt Evidences of the preſence of the Spirit of Chriſt, and hardeſt to be counterfeited, are Gentleneſs, Goodneſs and Meekneſs; and I called to mind that a tender Father won'd not reprove his erring Children, nor a good Man treat his Friend with Bitterneſs, Pride, Scoffing or Lightneſs. That a Paſtour has no leſs reaſon for bowels of compaſſion towards his ſtraying Sheep, than a Father towards his Children: That a Chriſtian was as deeply obliged to Meekneſs towards his erring Brother, as any Man towards his deareſt Friend. *And* tho' that Brother be miſtaken in his judg-

ment

ment, and alienated in his affections to the higheſt degree, even to Railing and Madneſs, yet the injured perſon ought ſtill to treat him with the ſame gentleneſs and tenderneſs, and look on all thoſe Extravagancies as the effects of a Spiritual Feaver, which to a mind truly affected with the love of Chriſt, are as little provoking as the ravings occaſioned by a natural one, and much more to be pittied.

II. Theſe were the conſiderations I had before me, and the meaſures I took in writing my Book, and I hope in God they ſhall always remain with me, and influence my words and actions; and I thank God they yield me a comfort and ſatisfaction above all that the World can afford me.

But this was very different from what many of your Party expected; they meaſured me not from what I am, or from what I do and ſay, but from the Repreſentations ſome of themſelves had made of me. 'Twas from theſe that a rumour went abroad whilſt my Book was in the Preſs, that I was publiſhing a moſt furious Book full of bitterneſs and railing; and that I wou'd now diſcover what a paſſionate angry Man I was: This went current; But when my Book appeared I thank God it was of a different ſort, and very much ſurpriſed thoſe whoſe intereſt it was to repreſent me and it otherwiſe; and by all I can learn, nothing diſpleaſed them more than the Seriouſneſs, Charity and Civility with which it was Written.

III. Mr. *B.* ſeems to be ſenſible that this gives my Book ſome advantage, and takes great care to prevent it; Sometimes he makes ſlight of it, ſometimes endeavours to expoſe it as ridiculous: But his greateſt endeavour is to perſwade you that it is not real and ſincere in me. To make this appear probable he produces ſeveral Arguments both in his Preface, and in his *Remarks*, in which he inſiſts on one, *p.* 157. and on which he thinks fit to enlarge again in his Vindication (*p.* 25.) 'Tis taken from a Clauſe in the Leaſes of the See of *Derry*, whereby the Tenants are obliged not to ſett to *Maſs-Prieſts*, or *Diſſenting Miniſters*: This he thinks will excuſe all the hard words he gives me, and prove me guilty *of unfair dealing*; but this is to cenſure actions before he knows the reaſon of them, as I ſuppoſe every body may obſerve; and ſince it concerns only my own Perſon I did not think it neceſſary to make any Apology for it; and I aſſure you my tenderneſs to you, and indeed to our common Chriſtianity, obliged me rather to ſuffer the reproach, as I have done in many other Caſes, than to Publiſh thoſe things of which I appre-

hended the common Enemies of our Religion might make advantage. And had not the importunity and perſwaſions of my Friends, to whoſe Judgments I have a Deference, required it from me, no provocations of my Anſwerers ſhou'd now have done it. However I ſhall endeavour to give an account of this matter in the leaſt offenſive way I can; and if any thing ſeem hard in it, the blame muſt be juſtly theirs who gave the occaſion.

IV. I find this Clauſe *Verbatim* (ſo far as relates to *Popiſh Prieſts*) in the oldeſt Leaſes of this See of *Derry*; in which there has been, ſince the Reformation, a ſucceſſion of Wiſe, Learned and Pious Men, my Predeceſſors. Dr. *Montgomery*, Dr. *Babington*, Dr. *Downam*, Dr. *Bramhall*, Dr. *Wild*, Dr. *Meſſom*, Dr. *Ward*, and Dr. *Hopkins*, were Men generally famous for their Works yet remaining, and for their Eminent Service they did to the Church of God. Theſe found it neceſſary to put this Clauſe into their Leaſes (at the the firſt making of them) or to continue it, in as many as were renewed: So far therefore this is no new Clauſe it being (as I have ſaid) in the oldeſt Leaſes of the See, and put in by Wiſe and Good Men for good Reaſons.

I found the ſame reaſons not only to continue it, but to extend it to all *Teachers Diſſenting from the Church*; and ſhou'd have thought my ſelf anſwerable to my Succeſſours, if whilſt the Reaſons were as good, I had departed from the wiſe Conduct of my Predeceſſors, That the Reaſons are as good will appear from what follows.

My predeceſſors found that their Tenants lived eaſily, as to Rents, and freeſt of any from Exactions or Oppreſſions, and that this made, and ſtill makes thoſe that are moſt avers to the Office and Revenues of a Proteſtant Biſhop, yet deſirous to be their Tenants; that the Popiſh Prieſts eſpecially found their advantage in living under them, both to their Temporal and Spiritual intereſt; for they had ſuch influence on their own Party, that none of them durſt come in competition with them, in taking their Farms, and ſo they had them at what rate they pleas'd, and (where they had ſuch influence) the Proteſtants durſt not take them; by which means they were able to keep them waſte, if they could not get them to themſelves; which I have effectually found in a Farm where one of them had crept in: And as to their Spiritual intereſt, it was no ill policy to ſecure thoſe places where the Biſhop had greateſt influence. I am ſure theſe things are true of your Miniſters, and theſe, or the like Motives ſo far prevail'd on them, that before the Troubles, they had at leaſt one half of their Meetings on the Church Lands. Again

Again no one wou'd willingly have a Tenant that looks on him as an Uſurper, or is ſworn to Extirpate him as ſoon as he can; this was a good reaſon to refuſe Popiſh Prieſts for Tenants, and holds no leſs againſt ſuch of your Teachers as adhere to the Solemn League and Covenant.

I muſt mind you alſo that Coſhering and Exacting on Tenants by way of Meat and Lodging is againſt the Laws of this Kingdom; and the Popiſh Prieſts lived by ſuch ways; but were not near ſo oppreſſive to their Neighbours as your Meetings are: Your Sacraments eſpecially are attended with a moſt oppreſſive coſhering; and ſo it is, and muſt be, where 4 or 5000 meet together from diſtant places, and ſtay ſeveral days. And indeed none that live near the Meeting-Houſe can call their Meat or Drink, or Graſs or Houſes their own, during theſe times; or dare refuſe them to thoſe Coſherers, if they wou'd live quietly. And here I muſt declare that I had private Information from ſeveral of my Tenants of this Oppreſſion; and they were heartily glad when they found I had contrived a way to eaſe them, tho' they durſt not publickly own it.

There is a further Reaſon, and that is, That Men whoſe avowed principle it is to Tolerate no body, when they have power, ought not to pretend to the ſame favour with other people that are moderate. This is a juſt exception againſt Popiſh Prieſts; and for ought yet appears, it is no leſs againſt your Teachers, ſome of which ſeem to be of as perſecuting a Spirit as they; and have ſo far influenced the moſt zealous of their Hearers, that they already perſecute, as far as they have power thoſe that diſſent from them; inſomuch that (as I obſerved before) ſome that are heartily deſirous to come to Church, dare not, for fear of being undone by their Neighbours.

And no wonder it ſhould be ſo, ſince you are Taught in your very Catechiſm to *Oppoſe all falſe Worſhip; and according to each ones Place and Calling to remove it.* And *Tollerating a falſe Religion* is reckon'd, in expreſs Terms, a breach of the Second Commandment. *A* Clauſe very unfit for a Catechiſm, that ought to contain only the Principles of our Holy and Meek Religion; and which I do not find in the Catechiſm of the Council of Trent, notwithſtanding the perſecuting Spirit of that Church; and indeed it is not only a wicked, but an imprudent thing to impoſe on all Chriſtians the neceſſity of either perſecuting all their Neighbours that are miſtaken in

See larger Catechiſm. Q. What is commanded & what is forbidden in the 2 Commandment?

in matters of Religion, or violating their own Conſciences ; which ſufficiently ſhews the Spirit of thoſe that Compos'd your Catechiſm, and diſcovers the Principle that makes you ſo uneaſy to your Neighbours ; which Principle your Teachers ſtill refuſe to renounce.

Theſe I ſuppoſe are ſufficient to ſhew that there is neither raſhneſs or uncharitableneſs in this Clauſe of my Leaſes, which has now been three times objected to me in print, twice by Mr. *B.* and once by Mr. *Craighead*, as if it were indeed of moment, or any thing to the ſubject of my Book : But this makes it plain that the buſineſs of the Anſwerers was to anſwer my Book by prejudicing people againſt my Perſon ; a certain ſign that they wrote for a Party rather than truth.

After all, I muſt profeſs to you, and have always declared, that it never was my intention by that Clauſe to hinder any one to live under me that was peaceable, and of whoſe honeſty, as a Tenant, I could have any reaſonable ſecurity, of what perſwaſion ſoever he was : But I thought it but reaſonable to reſerve to my ſelf, & my Succeſſors a Liberty to make a difference between moderate honeſt Men, whom one may ſuppoſe to be lead by Conſcience, and others that appear to be acted by other motives ; which ſhall always be the Rule of my Proceedings.

There is a further matter under this Head which Mr. *B.* objects to me (*Vind. p.* 25.) in theſe words, *We like not the gentle Language of Writs de Excom. Cap.* By which he would inſinuate ſome very hard or *unfair Dealing* in me. A few words will clear it ; I never procur'd more then one of theſe Writs to be Executed, and that againſt a Perſon who refus'd to ſtand for Sideſman (being duly Elected by his Pariſh, or to find another for it) which the very Act of Toleration in *England* requireth for to be done ; and the Government on full Conſideration of the matter, found I had reaſon in it ; and the perſon confeſs'd that he would never have contended it (as indeed he neither had, nor cou'd have any ſcruple) had not his Miniſter, Mr. *Crook*, engag'd to bring him off, if he ſtood it out, which I am able to prove. But Mr. *B.* makes no ſcruple to Cenſure his Governours, before whom this matter was adjudged, and pronounce concerning things of which it is manifeſt he had no due Information.

CHAP.

Having thus examined the principal matters of fact, I muſt obſerve that Mr. *B.* (who makes himſelf your *Advocate.*) in the end of his Vindication, *p.* 55) takes it for granted that the *matters of fact* with which I charged you, and for the truth of which I *appealed* to your own Knowledge and Conſciences, were falſe; and alledges it as the greateſt provocation given you that I *appealed* to your *ſelves as Evidences for what* you *certainly know to be untrue.* I do not find any ſufficient ground for his aſſerting this in your behalf; I have converſed with many of you ſince the writing of my Book and Admonition, before many Witneſſes, and cou'd never meet with any of you that cou'd deny any one matter of Fact in them: And as to the Vouchers that Mr. *B.* has produced to diſprove what I ſaid, they are ſo far from juſtifying what he aſſerted, as to your practice, or contradicting what I charged on you, that the truth of his Aſſertions depends ſtill on his own Credit. But whatever effect his endeavours, to palliate the matters with which I tax you may have on ſtrangers, they can never make you think otherwiſe of them then what you know.

And I am ſure you cannot but know (what I have been now neceſſitated to prove in the foregoing Chapter) that the main and moſt conſiderable matters which I charged on you were true: That your Communions have been ſcandalouſly infrequent; That your publick Worſhip of God was generally performed by you ſitting, which I reckon irreverent; That you had no orderly publick reading of the Scriptures, nor any practice that cou'd properly be called Reading them; That you have no order or rule of teaching the great Myſteries of our Religion in your Sermons, or ſet Diſcourſes; which certainly do deſerve ſuch ſet Diſcourſes, if any thing can deſerve them.

I am conſcious to my ſelf, and have God for my witneſs, that I had no deſign in what I have publiſhed of your Faults in the Worſhip of God, but to endeavour, according to my duty, your amendment of them, (of which could I have made you ſenſible in a private way, you ſhould not have been told ſo publickly.) And it had been a very ridiculous undertaking for me, as I often have obſerved before, to put the ſtreſs of your reforming them (which I moſt ſeriouſly coveted and deſired) upon your knowledg of the truth of them, if I had not been ſure that you did ſufficiently know it; nay had I not underſtood it from the mouths and confeſſion of many of you.

But

But the Truth is, theſe Things are ſo Notorious, ev'n from the Defence which your *Advocate* and his *Certifiers* wou'd make for you, That I had, and ſtill have all Reaſon to appeal to your own Conſciences for the Truth of them, and to hope for the deſired Succeſs of my Writings in your amendment of them, from the undeniable evidence of this Truth in your ſelves; which Succeſs I thank God, I have already in ſome meaſure found, and do beſeech him ſtill to increaſe.

CHAP. II.

CHAP. II.

Of the Reaſoning part of Mr. B's. Book.

Sect. I.

Mr. B's. ſtating the Caſe between You and Us as to Purity of Worſhip and Diſcipline.

I. I Proceed now to ſome Obſervations on the Reaſoning Part of Mr. *B*'s. Book: And the firſt thing I ſhall take Notice of is his Stating the Difference between You and Us, *Vind. p.* 33. we have theſe words, *Where there are in a Kingdom two Parties, or Bodies of Proteſtants, in one of which both the Worſhip and Diſcipline of Chriſt is more fully reſtored to its Primitive Simplicity and Purity; In the other, there are ſome Defects and Corruptions left in their Worſhip, and Diſcipline almoſt intirely neglected, or perverted and abuſed. I think every conſiderate Chriſtian ſhould prefer the ſtated Communion of that Party, in which neceſſary Reformation has made a happier Progreſs.* I confeſs I am partly of Mr. *B*'s. opinion; and think for this very reaſon you ought to embrace the Communion of our Church, as of that in which both Worſhip and Diſcipline is more fully reſtored to its Primitive Simplicity and Purity; For I do not know one thing in which you have the advantage of us, as will appear on Examination of theſe particulars.

II. *Firſt*, In *Diſcipline* you have nothing to boaſt of, ſince you have no Authentick Rule concerning it at all, as I ſhewed in my *Admonition*: and when Propoſals were made concerning it, they were rejected by a Parliament of your own Party with great Abhorrence; *We cannot*, ſay they, in their Declaration 1646. *conſent to the granting of an Arbitrary and Unlimitted Power and Juriſdiction to near* 10000 *Judicatories to be Erected within this Kingdom, and this demanded in a way inconſiſtent with the Fundamentals of Government, excluding the power of Parliaments.* The queſtion then between your Diſcipline and Ours, is, whether it is better to have no Rules, but meer Arbitrary Power in ten thouſand Judicatories to exerciſe a Diſcipline, in-

conſiſtent with the Fundamental Laws of the Kingdom, and the power of *Parliaments*; or to have certain and determinate Rules for the Exerciſe of it: Such as our Canons and Rubricks, which are very conſiſtent with the Conſtitution of the Kingdom, and wou'd certainly reform the World if executed; and nothing hinders their execution (that I know) but your Separation. I cannot reckon it *a happy Progreſs* in Reformation, as Mr. *B.* does, to throw down a well Eſtabliſhed Diſcipline founded on good Authority, and with good Rules, and Eſtabliſh nothing in the place of it. 'Tis not *Purity* of Diſcipline to make it Arbitrary, and have no Rules at all. And yet I am afraid many are for reforming Faith as you have reformed Diſcipline.

III. *Secondly*, In your *Church Conſtitution*; you are not yet agreed, and we do not know what you wou'd have. I obſerved that Mr *B*'s ſenſe of theſe things is much different from yours; both as to the Rules and Manner of proceeding in your Judicatories, inſomuch as you are not yet agreed who ſhall have the *Power of the Keys*, whether a ſingle Congregation, or a *Presbytery* (*Ad. p.* 47.) to make you a little ſenſible of this I will compare Mr. *B.* and his Parties Sentiments with Yours.

Firſt then, You own generally a National Church is of Divine Inſtitution, but Mr. *B* and his Party declare (*Reflect. p.* 4.) That *ſuch a National Church is not of Divine Inſtitution*, and is indeed only *A Combination of Churches as united under one Civil Sovereign, its true notion lies not in any Combination purely Eccleſiaſtical and Intrinſical, but Civil and Extrinſical.*

Secondly, You hold that many particular Congregations may be under one Presbyterial Government. Mr. *B.* and his party that no *particular Church ſhall be Subordinate to another* —— and that none of *them, their Officer or Officers ſhall Exerciſe any power, or have any Superiority over any other Church, or their Officers.* Heads of agreement, *p.* 11.

You hold that it is agreeable to the Word of God that there be a Subordination of Congregational, Claſſical, Provincial and National Aſſemblies, for the Government of the Church. Mr. *B.* and his Party, That *Church Councils are not for Government, but for Unity; not as being in Order of Government over the ſeveral Biſhops.* Reflect. *p.* 58. And heads of Agreement, *p.* 10.

Thirdly, You hold that Excommunication is a ſhutting the Kingdom

dom of Heaven againſt impenitent Sinners. But with Mr. *B.* and his party *Excommunication it ſelf, in their Reſpective Churches* is *no other than a declaring ſuch Scandalous Members as are irreconcileable, to be incapble of Communion with them in things peculiar to the viſible Believers.* (Preface to the Heads of Agreement.) In which ſenſe any two Men may Excommunicate a Third, it requires no power at all to declare a Man incapable of Communion with me, but only Judgment, and ſo there is an end of Chuch-Governours and Cenſures.

Fourthly, You hold that thoſe that are Ordained ought not to be Ordained again; but Mr. *B.* and his Party Teach, That if any hold in *caſe of the Removal of one formerly Ordained, to a new Station or Paſtoral Charge, there ought to be a like Solemn Recommending him and his Labours to the Grace and Bleſſing of God: No different Sentiments or Practice herein, ſhall be any occaſion of Contention or breach of Communion amongſt you.*

Fifthly, You hold that *Ruling Elders* are of Divine Right, and your Conſtitution, ſo far as appears to us, is Founded on them; but Mr. *B.* and his Party declare, That *whereas divers are of Opinion that there is alſo the Office of Ruling Elders — and others think otherwiſe: They agree that this make no breach among them. Heads of Agr. p.* 13.

Sixthly, You hold that the Ruling Officers of a particular Congregation, have only power to ſuſpend from the Lord's-Table, and that Caſting out belongs to the Presbytery. But Mr. *B.* and his Party hold, That *each particular Church, hath Authority from Chriſt, for Exerciſing Government, and of enjoying all the Ordinances of Worſhip within it ſelf. Heads of Agr. p.* 4.

All theſe are material Differences, and concern the Being of a Government, and in all of them you differ from Mr. *B.* and his Party, and only in one of them from us, that is in the Fifth, and then judge what progreſs it is in Reformation, to ſeparate from a National Conſtitution, to joyn with ſuch, that do not ſo much as pretend to it.

IV. *Thirdly*, Your *Purity* that ſhould invite men to Joyn with you, doth not conſiſt in *Doctrine*; for in this, confeſſedly, you have no advantage of us: For theſe very *Heads of Agreement* acknowledge it ſufficient, as to *Soundneſs of Judgment in Matters of Faith*, to own the *Doctrinal part of thoſe commonly called, The Articles of the Church of England*, which we all Subſcribe: You then have made no Progreſs in this point.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, As to *Preaching the Gospel*, which is a neceſſary Mark of the *Purity* of a Church. It is manifeſt, you come ſhort of us; the great Myſteries thereof being neither ſo Diligently, ſo Conſtantly, ſo Regularly, or ſo Univerſally Taught by your Miniſters, as in our Church; nor ſo Good and Obliging Rules for doing ſo: So that men that wou'd hear them Taught in this manner, ought to joyn with us as I have already ſhewed.

Fifthly, As to the *Adminiſtring the Sacraments*, which is another neceſſary Mark of the *Purity* of a Church: Your Miniſters have been Notoriouſly Defective, they have let many die without Baptiſm that had a Title to it, and have been no leſs negligent in Adminiſtring the Lord's-Supper, inſomuch, that not one of them have done their Duty this Thirty Years in Adminiſtring it often, as Chriſt requires. Therefore, thoſe of you that wou'd partake frequently of this Sacrament, muſt joyn with our Church.

Sixthly, As to *Holineſs of Life*, you have no advantage over us, being no better then your Neighbours; and if you take away ſuch as are not of us, as a Church, but as we are the Governing Party, and who will always Joyn themſelves to that which is ſo, I doubt whether you be ſo good. There needs no more to convince you of this, than to conſider that Mercy, Juſtice and Truth are counted by our Saviour, to be the great things of the Law; and you will not find that the Proteſtants in the North of *Ireland*, where you are moſt numerous, are more noted for theſe, than the Proteſtants in other parts of the Kingdom; which ſufficiently ſhews that whatever you pretend, your *Diſcipline* has no great effect; of which, other Demonſtrations might be given: It may ſeem in Speculation an Advantage, as the Auricular Confeſſion of the Papiſts, but has hitherto produced as little effect.

Seventhly, As to the *Lives and Converſations* of your *Miniſters*, You have no reaſon to Boaſt till we ſee their Intereſt ſeparated from their Engagements to Sobriety; and till they have undergone ſuch a Scrutiny as the Clergy of *Down* and *Connor* did; that is, till they be tryed by above 300 Oaths, as the Clergy there were, if we reckon the Church-Wardens and other Witneſſes. And as to their Tempers, I do not find that they are more Mortified, more Humble, have a leſs Opinion of themſelves, or command their Paſſions better than other people; and for the Proof of this I appeal, not only to thoſe of this Dioceſs, but to the moſt Eminent, moſt Celebrated and Leading Men that

that have been of your Party; conſult their Writings, and you will not find more Meekneſs, Humility or Charity in them, nor leſs Paſſion, Bitterneſs and Gall, than in their adverſaries: Witneſs the firſt and ſecond *Admonition* in Queen *Elizabeths* time, Mr. *Cartwright's* Writings, Mr. *Rutherford*, Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Alſop*, and if you pleaſe Mr. *Boyſe's*. Now we are told by St. *James*, *Chap.* 1. 26 *If any man among you ſeem to be Religious, and bridle not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, that Man's Religion is vain*; much more if he bridle not his Pen. There will be Peeviſh, Paſſionate and Railing Writers of all Parties; but men that are truly holy will hardly be provoked to any degree of theſe Vices, and ought never to be truſted as Guides, if they are.

Laſtly, As to your *Worſhip*, you have no perfect Rule for it; for Mr. *B.* has given up your Directory as imperfect in ſeveral particulars, of great Moment, and left it to your own Diſcretion to mend it, *Vind. p.* 35. I think I have proved it to be not only imperfect, but in one particular that it confeſſedly Teaches contrary to Scripture, and believe I have ſhew'd, and can ſhew, that it does the ſame in ſeveral others. This ſeems to me to be the ſtate of the caſe between you and us; and I have as good Reaſon to ſuppoſe it thus, as Mr. *B.* has to ſuppoſe that the *Worſhip and Diſcipline of Chriſt* is more fully reſtored to its *Primitive Purity and Simplicity* amongſt you than us; for which I think there is no pretence.

IV. Mr. *B.* alledges, (*Vind. p.* 32.) That the abuſes contained in his Thirteen Demands, *Rem. p.* 170. are the chief *Obſtacles to a happy Union among us, which has been ſo long the Earneſt Deſire of all good men.* But this doth no ways appear to be true, ſince no men Laboured more earneſtly to remove ſome of them than Papiſts, and thoſe of no Religion, who are willing to deſtroy our National Conſtitution as being a Curb and Barrier againſt them, and when they can once effect that, they know well enough how to hinder the Settlement of any other; as appeared fully by the long Parliament that took down our Government, but never Eſtabliſh'd another; and as to their being the chief Obſtacle to our Union, conſider whether we were nearer an Union when they were removed; on the contrary, Sects and Diviſions grew more in Four Years, than in Fourſcore before; Witneſs Mr. *Edwards Gangrena*, *p.* 125 *p.* 143. and throughout, and this amongſt *Perſons counted Religious*; and therefore Mr. *B.* before we take his word, muſt give us good aſſurance that the removal of

them will not open a Door to all *Hereſies*, *Strange Opinions*, *Fearful Diviſions*, *Looſeneſs of Life and Manners*, as it did then; and as the Weakning of them has done of late. Some of thoſe he calls *Abuſes*, when truly repreſented, rather ſeem to us the Barriers againſt Diviſion than obſtacles of Union. What is really amiſs is not in our Conſtitution, but in ſome reſtraints the Common Law puts on us, and it is a queſtion whether it be ſafer to remove them. The Lawyers and the Parliament ſay no, when we have laboured for it. And none more fierce to preſs their continuance than thoſe of your Party: However theſe are no more to be imputed to us, than the great Grievance of Impropriations. Or your Miniſters not having the Tythes and Churches, is to be imputed to your Miniſters But to deal ingeniouſly, all this is not to the matter; the great Task incumbent on Mr. *B.* is, to ſhew a Precedent in Scripture of two Parties, ſuch as he deſcribes, where on pretence of Purer Diſcipline, one of them gathered a Congregation of Chriſtians in the ſame place diſtinct and ſeparate from others, who Worſhiped God in true Faith and Holineſs. This I did put to him in my *Admonition*, *p.* 48. and he has given it no Anſwer, tho' the moſt Material thing in it, and Diſciſive of the Queſtion; and without which, you will never Juſtify your ſelves by Scripture for abſenting your ſelves from our Aſſemblies for Worſhip, much leſs your ſending out Emiſſaries to draw off others: There was the ſame Reaſon for Forming ſuch Parties in the Apoſtles time as now; ſome indeed did it upon Mighty pretences to the *Spirit*, and to *Purity*, Speaking great *Swelling Words of Vanity*, and having Mens *perſons in Admiration*, but St. *Jude* tells us that thoſe who ſeparated themſelves were *Senſual*, *having not the Spirit*; and Mr. *Edwards* obſerves the ſame of many of your great profeſſors, that firſt formed the Separation. There is nothing more eaſy or more deceitful than great pretences to *Purity*, and Men truly humble and good ſeldom inſiſt on them, as being deeply ſenſible of their own Imperfections, and ready to believe better of others than themſelves: 'Twere much more to to the purpoſe for us to joyn in the Common Worſhip of God, and in joynt and continual prayers togegether, that God would give us Mortified, humble and pure Hearts, than to pretend *Purity* of parties, and to ſtand by our ſelves, and with thoſe in *Iſa. Chap.* 65 5. Cry, *come not near me for I am holier than thou.* Diviſions are a *Work of the fleſh*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 3. and the great Inſuperable Obſtacle to Diſcipline. I pray God to

make

make you ſenſible of this, and to ſend down a Spirit of Unity, Peace and Purity upon us.

Sect. II.

Mr. B's. Partiality:

I. IN the Second place, let me put you in mind that Mr. *B.* doth not obſerve that Golden Rule of doing as he wou'd be done unto; for he takes the Liberty to put the moſt favourable Conſtruction he pleaſes on his own words, and expects we ſhould admit them: But on ours, he puts the worſt he can, and is diſſatisfied that we will not own them. Of which I will only give you a few Inſtances.

II. *Firſt*, He affirms *Rem. p.* 136. That the *generality of you, as he is aſſured, do Communicate four or five times a year.* This he interpreteth (*Vind p.* 17.) only of the *moſt devout and ſerious*; which is very different from the *Generality*; ſince if *One* do it, the words may be true in the ſenſe he gives of them; but I have allowed (as you ſee before) One in Four.

III. *Secondly*, He affirmed *Rem. p.* 136. That all of you have the opportunity of Communicating 10. 12. or 15. times a Year, if you will take the advantage of receiving it, as often as it is adminiſtred within a few Miles of your reſpective Habitations: This he interprets, *Vind. p.* 19. To *be Eſtimated from thoſe parts, where the main Body of Diſſenters are to be found*—— and *p.* 19. That he is *not obliged to prove it concerning every particular one in the Remoteſt parts of the Province of Ulſter.* As if the Dioceſs of *Ardmagh*, *Clogher*, *Rapho*, *Derry*, *Drummore*, with a conſiderable part of the Dioceſs of *Down* and *Connor*, were more in the Remote parts of *Ulſter* then *Antrim*, *Carrickfergus*, *Glenarm*, and the other places he mentions: But I fully ſhewed in my *Admonition* that there is no Congregation in the Dioceſs of *Derry*, nor I believe in any of the other places named, in which the people may Communicate ten times a year without Riding 40 Miles: which is very unreaſonable to expect, let them take what advantage they will. Nor had I any intention to confine you to one Dioceſs, as Mr. *B.* wou'd inſinuate, *Vind. p.* 18. I mean honeſtly and plainly in what I ſay, and never deſigned to help out a Cauſe by Equivocations.

And

And as to thoſe places Mr. *B.* has mentioned, they are all in a Nook or Corner; as may be ſeen by the Mapp; and yet by his own Confeſſion it requires 24 Miles Riding to attend them; and ſometimes 30: which are not a few Miles for the Generality of Country People; being an unreaſonable Charge, and impracticable by many, eſpecially by Women and Servants, who have as good a title to the Lords-Supper, and are often as ſerious and devout as the Maſters of Families. This contrivance therefore of ſending People from their Pariſh Churches, no ways anſwers, either in point of Conveniency, or Order, to the frequent Adminiſtration of that Sament in every Pariſh, nor is *Equivalent* to it, as he ſuggeſts *p.* 32.

IV. *Thirdly*, Whereas he aſſerts (*Rem. p.* 13.) That it is *Univerſally uſual in every Meeting where an Ordained Miniſter is ſettled, to have the Lords Supper Adminiſtred* —— *twice in the larger Towns, every Year.* He now tells us *Vind. p.* 17. That the twice a Year in *the Larger Towns was intended, and is true of Belfaſt, Carrickfergus and Antrim*: As if *Liſburn, Colerain* and *Londonderry* were not larger Towns then *Antrim*; and as if *Strabane, Newry, Ballymenagh, Ballymony, Ardmagh, Dungannon, Downpatrick*, and many others were not in an equal rank with it. And yet he has not produced any Voucher, that this practice has been conſtant in theſe very three Towns, or how long. Theſe and many ſuch are the favourable Interpretations he allows himſelf.

V. But then as to us he is reſolved to put what ſenſe on our words he pleaſes, and oblige us to ſtand by it. Thus he will needs know my deſign in publiſhing my Book better than my ſelf, and oblige me to deſign it for the generality of Diſſenters in *England*, as well as in *Ireland* (*Vind. p.* 6.) Tho' the whole ſcope of it, the Addreſſes in it, my Management of the Impreſſion, and the very Title I ſent with it to the Preſs [*For the uſe of this Dioceſs.*] (tho' loſt there, as the Printer muſt acknowledge, and another ſubſtituted in place of it, without my knowledge) ſufficiently declare the contrary.

VI. *Secondly*, He will pretend to know the deſign of our Church's uſing the Croſs in Baptiſm better than all her Sons from the Learned *Hooker* to this day; as you may ſee *Vind. p.* 44.

VII. *Thirdly*, Our Church in her Catechiſm in anſwer to that queſtion, *What is required of Perſons to be Baptiſed*, determines that *Repentance* and *Faith* are required. Mr. *B.* (after Mr. *Baxter*) puts a very abſurd ſenſe on theſe words, and then diſputes againſt them; alledging

alledging that by Repentance and Faith is meant *preſent Faith and Repentance*, *Vind. p.* 35. directly againſt the Catechiſm, which requires only preſent Faith and Repentance in thoſe that are capable of them.

But of Children who have a right to Baptiſm, and are not capable at preſent of actual Faith, *&c.* She accepts a rational preſumption, that they will believe, when capable, and an Engagement made by the Parents and Congregation, under whoſe power they are, ſolemnly declared by their Proxies and Vouchers, the Godfathers and Godmothers: It ſhews a mighty prejudice againſt the Eſtabliſhed Church, and a delight to find fault, in thoſe that inſiſt on ſuch forced and diſowned Conſtruction of our words; if we ſhould deal thus with the Holy Scripture it won'd expoſe even them.

VIII. *Fourthly*, Whereas I quote your Directory for a certain poſition, *Chap.* 2. *Sect.* 3. *N.* 2. meaning thereby that Book which commonly goes under that Name among You, and whoſe words one of your own Miniſters Mr. *Craghead* quotes as the *Expreſs words of the Directory*, *p.* 45. Mr. *B.* will oblige me to mean *The Directory made by the Aſſembly of Divines for Publick Worſhip*: Whereas I meant not that part of the Book, but the *Directions*, which are your Directory for Private Worſhip, as the other for the Publick; and which being bound together with the other, and with the Directory for Ordination of Miniſters, and other pieces, do all commonly paſs under the Name of the *Directory*, and are ſo quoted by one of your own Miniſters, as I have already ſhewed: Yet this he imputes to me as a very unpardonable miſtake, and repeats it again in his *Vind. p.* 23. I ſuppoſe every Body ſees this is nothing to the matter whether that poſition I quoted was in the Directory for Publick Worſhip, or in the Directions for Private; ſince both are owned and received by you to whom I wrote: Therefore for Mr. *B.* to inſiſt on it a ſecond time, plainly ſhews that his bus'neſs is with the Perſon, not the cauſe; and that he writes for a Party, not the truth; otherwiſe he would not offer a matter the ſecond time that is nothing to the purpoſe, and for which there was no ground, beſides his being unacquainted with the terms uſed among you.

IX. *Fifthly*, Whereas I laid it down as a thing that wou'd be granted me by you, that all ways of Worſhip are diſpleaſing to God, *That are not expreſly contained in Scripture, or Warranted by Example*

of Holy Men mentioned therein: Mr. *B.* misrepresents my sense (*Vind. p.* 30.) as if I had intended by this *Rule*, to exclude such things as may be deduced by *clear consequence* or *parity of reason* from them. Now I desire you to compare this Rule with your Catechism, and you will find it expressed there in these words, *The Second Commandment forbiddeth* the Worshiping of God by Images, or *any other way not appointed in his Word.* And in your *Confession of Faith* (*Chap.* 21. *N.* 1.) thus, "The acceptable way of Worshiping the true God "is Instituted by himself, and so limited to his own revealed Will, "that he may not be Worshiped according to the Imaginations and "devises of Men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible "Representations, *or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture.* This *Rule* is stricter, and needs greater Limitations then the words of my Book. For, *First*, Here is no Allowance for things Warranted by Scripture, tho' not prescribed; as many things are. *Secondly*, There is no Authority given to the Examples of Holy Men in Scripture, which are sufficient to warrant a Religious practice in Gods Worship, tho' they do not amount to an appointment or prescription, and are not always obligatory. In short your Catechism and Confession of Faith, if we take them according to the Letter, *make all ways of Worship unacceptable and unlawful that are not prescribed and appointed in Scripture.* Whereas my *Rule* allows *Examples* and *Precedents* of Holy Men to be a sufficient Warrant. I supposed (and I think with reason) that you understood this Rule in your own Catechism and Confession of Faith, with due Limitations; and therefore had no reason to suspect but you would understand it with the same Limitations in my Book, it being a manifest partiality to except against it when used by me, and yet allow of it (tho' expressed with less caution) in your Catechism and Confession of Faith, which yet ought to be more exact in wording a *Rule*, then is necessary in a private Man's Writings. Of this Partiality Mr. *B.* is guilty; and plainly discovers by it that he has one Rule for Interpreting the words of his own Party, and another for Interpreting those of his Adversary.

But *Secondly*, I desire you to observe, That in my whole Book I never used this Rule, otherwise then with those limitations that I have now expressed; nor has Mr. *B.* produced one Instance wherein I did otherwise. As for Example, I tax you with bringing in the Inventions of Men, into the Service of God, in your *Use of the Psalms*;

Pſalms; not for Singing the Meetre Pſalms, for that I allow Lawful but for introducing them without neceſſity, to the excluſion of the Proſe Pſalms, for Singing of which we have Scripture Warrant and Example. I taxed you likewiſe with introducing a Human Invention into the Worſhip of God, in your *Expounding Scripture*; not that Expoſitions of Scripture are Unlawful, but to make them neceſſary every time the Scripture is read, is Literally ſuch an Invention; and ſo is likewiſe your excluding the Regular and Orderly Reading the Word of God, as he has appointed for the Edification of his Church, to make room for your Lectures; of both which, you have been guilty theſe 50 Years laſt paſt. I paſt the ſame Cenſure on your *Extemporary Prayers*; not that I condemned them in all Caſes, but becauſe on the account of them, you had turned the Lord's Prayer, preſcribed in God's Word, and the uſe of Forms in the Ordinary Prayers of the Aſſemblies (which is the Scripture way of Praying on ſuch Occaſions) out of your Meetings: Whereas it is manifeſtly a Teaching for Doctrine the Commandments of Men, to Teach, as you do, that Praying Extemporary is more acceptable to God, or more Edifying, then Praying by a Form; there not being the leaſt colour in Scripture for ſuch a Doctrine. I might ſhew the like in every place of my Book where I uſed this *Rule*, either in Proving the Orders of our Church, or in Diſproving yours: ſo that Mr. *B.* had no reaſon to find fault with it.

But *Thirdly*, The Rule needs not theſe Limitations, it being agreed by all ſober Interpreters, That whatever can be deduced from Scriptures by *Clear Conſequence* or *Parity of Reaſon*, is ſufficiently Warranted by them, tho' not expreſly contained in them; ſo there was no neceſſity to explain the *Rule*, tho' I was willing to avoid the Exceptions even of the Captious; and therefore put in the Explication you find in my Second Edition.

Fourthly, Mr. *B.* Excepts againſt my uſing the Phraſe of *Ways of Worſhip*, and alledges I uſed it *frequently to ſignify Circumſtantial Modes of it*, *Vind. p.* 30. But I anſwer, That I uſed the Phraſe with which your were acquainted, whereas I believe few of you ever heard of *Circumſtantial Modes* of Worſhip before; and I uſed it in the Senſe you generally do, when you ask for Scripture to Warrant our uſing the Pſalms by way of Anſwering, our uſing Forms of Prayer, our Singing with Inſtrumental Muſick, our Joyning our Voices in ſome Prayers, our Receiving the Sacrament in a Worſhiping poſture,

ſture, and the other particulars againſt which you Except in our publick Service; and I ſhewed theſe *Ways* are not only Warranted, but Preſcribed for the moſt part, in Scripture: Whereas thoſe Ways you have introduced in the place of them, have neither Command or Precedent in Scripture. If theſe that I have named in our Service and yours, be *Circumſtantial Modes*, they are the chief and greateſt Exceptions that I ever found any of you make againſt joyning with us; and they are the great matter of Reformation ſet forth in your Directory, tho' Mr. *B.* ſeems to make light of them.

From the whole I think it appears, That Mr. *B.* has both perverted and miſapplied my *Rule*; and yet on this perverted ſenſe of my Words, are Founded moſt of his Arguments againſt our Publick Worſhip.

X. Laſtly, This method of fixing Principles upon me, and then Writing a Book to Confute them, is not new with Mr *B.* He did it once before at a very unſeaſonable time, and ſtill perſiſts in Taxing me with his own Conſequences, as if I indeed owned them. Thus, *Vind. p.* 25. he charges me with Paſſing *a Vertual Sentence of Damnation* publickly upon you, by *Denying you to be a part of the Catholick Church*; and this he puts in *Italian* Letters, as if they were my Words: but there are no ſuch Words in any Book I have yet Written, nor any juſt Ground to fix ſuch a Sentence on me; the whole Myſtery of this, ſo far as I know it, is thus. Mr. *Manby*, formerly Dean of *Derry*, on his turning Papiſt, publiſhed his Motives which prevailed with him to do ſo: To theſe I wrote an Anſwer, in the Year 1687, by which, I thank God, the Proteſtant Cauſe loſt nothing, and it was ſo well approved, that it was Twice Re-printed in *England*: But Mr. *B.* con'd not digeſt it, and therefore wrote Reflections on it; and the greateſt Exception he has againſt it is, that I ſay in it, That I *meant by the Catholick Church the whole Body of Men profeſſing the Religion of Chriſt, and living under their Lawful Governours.* From which Words, Mr. *B* draws many ſtrange and abſurd Conſequences, alledging that they Un-Church all Diſſenters, all foreign Churches, and render the *relation of all true Chriſtians to our Bleſſed Lord (as his members) as queſtionable as the Title of the Paſtour under whom they live*; with many other abſurd Inferences contrary to the Literal Aſſertions of my Book; which therefore he wou'd perſwade us, contradicts it ſelf: But the World knew me too well, to need being troubled with a Juſtification; and tho' I had

had prepared one, my friends aſſured me it was unneceſſary to publiſh it, and I ſtill am of the ſame opinion.

XI. For I muſt let you know, that I ſaid no more in thoſe Words then the generality of Proteſtants ſaid before me. Some in the ſame Words, and the reſt in effect and meaning, even thoſe of your party not excepted; For I take it for a general Principle of Proteſtants, That the Preaching of the Word of God, and due Adminiſtration of the Sacraments are the true Marks of the Catholick Church; and that a lawful Miniſtry is neceſſary to theſe, inſomuch, that your own Confeſſion of Faith tells us, That neither Sacrament *may be Diſpenſed by any, but by a Miniſter lawfully Ordained*, Chap 27. and Chap. 28. That the *Outward Element in Baptiſm, is Water wherewith the Party is to be Baptized, In the Name*, &c. *by a Miniſter of the Goſpel lawfully called thereunto*: And the *Confeſſion* of the Church of *Scotland* has declared *Chap.* 23. That *Sacraments be rightly Miniſtrate we judge two things requiſite, The one, that they be Miniſtrate by lawful Miniſters.—— The other, that they be Miniſtrate in ſuch Elements, and in ſuch ſort as God hath appointed, or elſe we affirm that they ceaſe to be the right Sacraments of Chriſt.*

You ſee then from the Declaration of your own Party, that a lawful Miniſtry is required to the due Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, and without ſuch Adminiſtration there can be no true Church; and a man that is not duly Baptized, is not yet a viſible Member of the Catholick Church, tho' he may belong to it. From theſe it were eaſy (if one wou'd imitate Mr. *B*'s. way of Reaſoning) to draw the ſame Conſequences as he doth from my Words, indeed worſe; and to argue that theſe Poſitions make every man's Baptiſm as uncertain, as the Ordination of the Miniſter that Baptized him; and that every Church is as uncertain of her being a True Church, as of the Lawful Calling of her Miniſters: And all theſe Queſtions Mr. *B.* ſtarts concerning the Lawful Calling of Miniſters and Governors, will come in here as properly as he brings them againſt me; but whoever ſhould draw ſuch Conſequences from theſe Principles, which are common to moſt Reformed Churches, wou'd be as unjuſt to them as Mr. *B.* is to me.

For in this, the ſincere will and endeavour is accepted, both by God and Man, for the deed; and therefore neither the Aſſembly of Divines, nor the Church of *Scotland* intended to make void the Baptiſm of thoſe who out of the Sincerity and Simplicity of their Hearts

received it from such as they supposed lawfully called Ministers, but were not; neither did I ever intend to exclude from the Catholick Church, such as either out of weakness of Judgement, submitted themselves to Pastours whom they believed lawful; or out of necessity (when they cou'd not get others to officiate for them) submitted to such as they found settled. And this I shewed to be my Sense from St. *Augustine's* Words, Quoted at large in the Sixth Page of my Answer to Mr. *Manby*, of which Mr. *B.* never took any notice when he made all his Consequences for me, tho' there needed no more to destroy them all.

XII. But I must now tell you that this is no comfort to such as out of Interest or Passion, divide the Church, and heap up to themselves Teachers according to their own Lusts; nor to such as Knowingly or out of Willful Negligence joyn themselves to such: These I take to be the Hereticks St. *Paul* Commands us to Reject after the first and second Admonition, and they are *Self-condemned*; for the Church can Condemn them no otherwise, but by casting them out by Excommunication, and they have thus Condemned themselves already by their separation; and I see no reason any one has to be displeased at these Principles, except he be conscious, that out of Interest or Passion he has divided the Church, as I am afraid many are, or think it a small matter to make such Divisions: Or Lastly, is indifferent whether his Minister is Lawfully called or no, as indeed too many are, who are not much concerned how a man came by his Ordination, so he Preach to their mind. But I suppose the best way to deal with a Papist, will be to assert not only the *Lawfulness*, but *Regularity* of our Ministry, and I thank God, we have done it effectually; If Mr. *B* cou'd have done as much for his Party, he needed not have Gratified Papists (tho' his Party at that time were Caress'd by them) in endeavouring to Answer a Book, grounded on Principles, which they cou'd not Reply to, as appeared by the event. But this has always been the Method of those that separated from the Church; so *Tertullian* tells us, *De Præscriptionibus. Cum hoc sit Negotium illis, non ethnicos convertendi, sed nostros evertendi; hanc magis Gloriam captant, si stantibus ruinam, non si Jacentibus elevationem operantur*, &c. The Sense of which is, That those Separatists made it their Business to Oppose and Draw off the Members of the Church, and set up their Petty Sects, but did not joyn against the common Enemy.

XIII.

XIII. I muſt put you in mind that there are ſome Men eſpouſe a Party, and reſolve to make themſelves the Champions of it; and when they want direct proofs againſt their Adverſaries they draw ſtrange and abſurd Conſequences from their Opinions: And tho' they know very well that thoſe to whom they aſcribe them, deteſt theſe conſequences, as much as themſelves, yet they ſet them up, as if they were really held by ſuch as they impute them to; and endeavour by ſtrains of Rhetorick, and vehement interrogations to render them odious; this may take with ſuch as are heated with Faction, and love Books for ill Language, and Violence; but underſtanding Men know ſuch treament to be only an *Artifice* to keep up the Spirit of a Party, and make a ſhew of reaſon where direct proofs are wanting: *And* that it is really a giving up a Cauſe to fly to theſe *Arts*; and therefore they deſerve no Conſideration. Neither ſhou'd I have troubled the World or my Self to tell you that I hold none of the abſurd Conſequences Mr. *B* fixes on me, or that they do not follow from any principle of mine, had not one of your Miniſters, that ought to have had more Integrity and Juſtice, improved this Calumny on Mr. *B's. Authority* ſo far as to affirm that I held and Publiſhed that ſuch as you *belong not to the Catholick Church —— being without Chriſt having no hope and without God in the World*: All which he puts in the Italian Letters as if they were my words (Mr. *Craighead p.* 147.) Whereas I never either in Words or Writings uſed ſuch barbarous Expreſſions, or paſt ſuch an Unchriſtian cenſure on any Man, much leſs on any Body of Men that profeſſed to believe in Chriſt. But I can heartily forgive him, and wiſh him no more harm then that he may be ſenſible he has wronged me in at leaſt an hundred particulars beſides this.

I do not think it neceſſary, at preſent, to take any further Notice of his Book. This is ſufficient to ſhew how truly he has repreſented Matter of Fact, ſo far as he concurs with Mr. *B.* And as to his Reaſoning part I am content any one that reads my Book ſhould read his; and judge whether he has either truly repreſented my Senſe, or Anſwered my Arguments. I am well pleas'd that you have it in Print, ſince by comparing it with M. *B's*, you may plainly ſee that your *Advocates* are not yet agreed on what Principles to defend your Cauſe; There hardly being greater difference in Principles between the *Anſwers* and Book, then between the two *Anſwers* themſelves. But the greateſt advantage that I expect by it is,

That

That it will be a means to discover to Posterity how far the Learning and Sincerity of Your Teachers were agreeable to their Reputation and Profession; and what sort of Men have been followed by those that separate from Our Church.

The

The APPENDIX.

Containing an Answer to Mr. B's. Objections against the Sign of the Cross.

Sect. I.

Of the proper Method to discover the true Nature of Sacraments as Signs.

I. MR. *B.* in his Remarks on my Discourse to you *Concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God*, has given me many hard words for not treating of the Cross in Baptism (as I have observ'd in my *Admonition*, where also I have given my Reasons for not doing it, since it did not belong to the Ordinary part of Worship, which I only engaged to handle, *p.* 55.) imputing it to want of *Candour* and *Ingenuity*. And tho' I had given him no occasion for it, yet he resolved to bring in this dispute about it; because (as he alledges) it most directly concerns this charge of *Human Inventions in the Worship of God*, *Rem. p.* 463. And that here *The Dissenters particularly us'd to fix their charge of Human Inventions* against us. This then seemed to me the most direct and strongest Objection you had to prove your charge against us; and in which Mr. *B.* put most Confidence: So that if this failed, and had no force, the rest must fall in Course. And therefore I consider'd *It* only, and I believe in such a way as is fully satisfactory to all that Impartially read what I have said, and what Mr. *B.* has Answered: And tho' I might well let it rest on that foot, yet there being several things in Mr. *B*'s. Answer that tend to mislead your Judgments in greater matters than the Sign of the Cross; I have thought it requisite to give it a new and distinct Consideration.

The Sign of the Cross indeed I allow to be of no great weight in it self, but if we consider that the Condemning the use of it is in effect to Condemn the Universal Church that has used it from the Apostles

time, that to make ſuch Signs unlawful, when God has not made them ſo by any Command, is to add a Doctrine of our own to the Goſpel, a great Superſtition and a breach on our Chriſtian Liberty. And Laſtly, That the falſe Reaſonings brought to oppoſe it are of of ſuch ill Conſequence, that if they are not detected and expoſed, there is hardly any thing in a Church can be ſafe from ſuch Cavils, but the ſame ſort of Arguments will reach to the moſt approved Practices. If theſe things I ſay be conſider'd, this diſpute about the Croſs will not appear of ſo little moment, as ſome may imagine; Nor will it be ſafe for the Governours of Our Church to comply with the Teachers of ſuch Doctrines, leaſt they betray the Purity of the Goſpel, by allowing the *Doctrines of Men*, that wou'd make that unlawful in it ſelf, which God has left indifferent. We can very well joyn in Communion with a Church that does not uſe the Sign of the Croſs, as the Apoſtles did with ſuch as kept the *Jewiſh* Ceremonies, and abſtained from certain Meats: But when any come to impoſe this on our Conſciences as forbidden by God, we muſt in ſuch Caſes imitate St. *Paul*, who refus'd *to give place by Subjection, no not for an hour*, *Gal.* 2. 5. We reckon it a Liberty and Priviledge of the Church of God, and of all her Members to ſignify the Senſe and Devotion of their minds towards God in ſuch becoming actions and words as Univerſal Cuſtom has made Significant of our Thoughts and Paſſions in ſuch Caſes, as I have already proved in my former *Admonition*, *p.* 68. and ſhall further prove in this: And for any one to teach this to be unlawful, is to deprive us of a priviledge God has vouchſafed to us, to impoſe on our Liberty, and to Teach ſuch Doctrines as St. *Paul* Condemned for *Doctrines of Devils*, *Tim.* 4. 12. For *Forbidding to Marry*, and *to abſtain from Meats* are there reckoned ſuch Doctrines, becauſe they make that unlawful in it ſelf that God has allowed; and he has no leſs allowed us to expreſs the Devotions of our minds by ſignificant actions, than he has allowed us to feed our ſelves by all kind of wholeſom Meats. And therefore they that condemn the one as unlawful are equally Superſtitious with thoſe that then condemned the other.

II. To proceed then, I deſire you to remember that I undertook two things in my *Admonition*. Firſt, To ſhew that Mr. *B*'s. Arguments againſt the uſe of the Croſs were of no force. And Secondly, That it was Warranted by Holy Scripture. I ſhewed you that his great Objection againſt it was, that we make it *A New Human Sacrament*, and

and that then it muſt be *A Human Invention*. But in Order to ſatisfy you that we aſcribed nothing of a Sacramental Nature to it, I obſerv'd that three things were neceſſary to make up a Sacrament. Firſt, *An Outward viſible ſign Inſtituted by God, ſignifying ſome ſpiritual grace or benefit which we expect from him.* Secondly, *An Obligation on God by ſome promiſe of his to grant us that ſpiritual grace or benefit when we duly uſe the viſible ſign.* Thirdly, *A Penalty on us when we do not uſe it.* I ſhewed you that we aſcribed none of theſe to the Croſs in Baptiſm and conſequently that it hath nothing of a Sacrament in it.

For it muſt be conſidered that the word *Sacrament* is no Scripture word, but the Church has taken it up to expreſs ſome peculiar Inſtitutions, Rites or Signs which we find appointed by God; and the true way to know whether we aſcribe any thing of a Sacramental nature to any Sign, is to conſider the nature of thoſe Signs which we all agree to call *Sacraments*, and to obſerve diligently and impartially wherein they agree amongſt themſelves, and differ from all other Signs. I examined this as carefully as I cou'd, and found that they all agree'd in thoſe three things which I have before mentioned; and that they differed from all other Signs peculiarly in this one thing, *That they obliged God by his Promiſe upon the due uſe of theſe Signs, to give us the Grace or Spiritual Benefit ſignified by them.* It is this Promiſe annexed to theſe Sacraments that makes them ſo Valuable and Precious to us, above all other Signs, and without it, they wou'd be meer Ceremonies, and might be omitted or ſupply'd on very Ordinary Terms: Whereas now, nothing but Neceſſity can excuſe us from the uſe of them, if we wou'd enjoy the Promiſes of God annexed to them. Mr. *B.* in his *Vindication* doth not deny the three things which I have named, to be neceſſary to a Sacrament, nor doth he think himſelf obliged to prove that we aſcribe any of them to the Croſs; but he alledges that the account I have given of Sacraments, is *very Lame and Defective, omitting ſeveral Conſiderable Uſes of them, which were the chief ſtrength of his Arguments againſt the Croſs*, (*Vind. p.* 37) And (*p.* 38.) he adds, *That theſe ſacred Rites that are appointed by God, both in our firſt Publick Entrance into the Covenant, and our Publick Renewal of it at the Lord's-table, are deſign'd for ſeveral Uſes, and principally for the three following.*

1. *As Repreſenting Signs for Inſtruction, concerning the Priviledges and Duties of the Covenant, and our Guilt and Pollution*, &c.

2. *As*

2. *As Obliging Signs to Confirm and Ratify the Covenant entered into, and this both on God's part*, p. 39. and *from us to God*, p. 40.

3. *As Distinguishing Signs or Badges of our Profession, and the Relations we thereby are invested in*, which afterwards he explains by its being *a Mark and Character of those that belong to that one Visible Body or Church of which Christ is the Lord and Head*; and oppoſeth it to that *one internal Baptiſm* which he calls the *certain Mark of belonging to one invisible Church*, p. 43. The meaning of which Words is not eaſily comprehended, ſince he doth not explain whether he means by a *certain Mark* of belonging to an Inviſible Church, an outward and viſible Mark or how internal Baptiſm can be ſuch a Mark, whereas I think the generality of ſuch as have Written Conſiderately of theſe matters have made the external Baptiſm a Sign and a mean of the internal, and of our union not only to the viſible but likewiſe to the inviſible Church when duly received; and only ſuch as have in ſome meaſure imbibed the Socinian Doctrines have explained Baptiſm as a Mark of Union to the viſible Church in excluſion to the inviſible.

Theſe are the Uſes for which he tells us Sacraments are deſigned. And *p.* 44. adds, *That the Croſs is ſet up for ſeveral Sacramental uſes, even the like as Baptiſm and the Lord's-Supper are appointed for (except that one uſe of their being Obliging Signs on God's part to ratify his Promiſes)* And from thence infers, (*p.* 45) *That the Croſs is hereby made as much a Sacrament as men can make a Sign of their own.*

III. This wou'd indeed have been a good Inference, if he had prov'd that the Uſes he has named (ſo far as they differ from the three parts of a Sacrament before lay'd down by me) do not belong to any other Signs Warranted in Scripture, but only to the Sacraments. But he has not in the leaſt attempted it; and it wou'd be in vain, for I ſhall ſhew beyond exception, that all the uſes which he has named of Sacraments (ſo far as they can be applied to the Croſs) are common to many other Signs Warranted by Scripture; and not at all peculiar to Sacraments, for the Croſs cannot be made a Sacrament (nor a Human Sacrament it ſelf, which is indeed no Sacrament, but a noiſe of Words to amuſe common people with and affright them) but by being ſet up for ſuch Uſes as are ſo peculiar to the Sacraments, that they belong to them only, and not to any other Scriptural Signs whatſoever.

That which has led Mr. *B*, into this miſtaken way of Reaſoning, is,

is, That he conſidered what he conceives the *Two Sacraments agree with another in*; and in what they *differ from one another*, *Vind* p. 38. But then quite forgot to conſider wherein they differ from all other Scriptural Signs, which if he had done he wou'd have found that they do not differ from other Signs in any of the uſes which he has named, except that of obliging God by his promiſe to confer ſome Spiritual Grace.

He that wou'd know what a Man is, muſt not only conſider wherein all Men agree, but likewiſe wherein they differ from other Creatures. All Men agree in Life and Motion, but if any one wou'd conclude from thence that whatever has Life (as for Example, all Beaſts have) is a Man, wou'd be looked on as a very ill Reaſoner; and yet this is Mr. *B*'s. Method. He found both the Sacraments agree in being deſigned for Repreſenting, Obliging and Diſtinguiſhing Signs of the Duties, Priviledges and Relations of the New Covenant, whence he calls them *Federal Rites*, and ſpends ſeveral Pages to prove them deſigned for theſe Uſes, and from thence wou'd conclude that every Sign that repreſents obliges and diſtinguiſhes muſt be a Sacrament, from the inſtance of the Sign of the Croſs; but with as little reaſon as it would be concluded in the former Caſe, that whatever had Life and Motion is a Man.

IV. Before I proceed further to the Conſideration of theſe Uſes, I muſt caution you, Firſt, That I do not pretend to underſtand all the deſigns of God in Inſtituting Sacraments; For they are Myſteries and God has no where told us that he has diſcovered all his purpoſes in them. If we reflect on the Paſſover, the great Sacrament of the Old Teſtament, we ſhall not find that God did Explicitly diſcover the main deſign of it to the *Jews*, which was to ſignify and apply the Death of Chriſt to ſuch as Celebrated it, and who can be ſure that there is not a hidden and Myſtical deſign in Baptiſm and the Lords Supper, of which we are not aware; and of which at leaſt we have not a clear and explicit Notion? This Conſideration ought to make us diligent in the uſe of them, and modeſtly cautious in our diſcourſes and explanations of them.

Secondly, 'Tis eaſy to obſerve that Mr. *B.* has not expreſſed the *Uſes* of Sacraments in the Language of Scripture, but in that of the late Syſtems of Divinity and intereſted Writers; and ſeems rather to have regard in them to ſome late Notions and Prejudices, parti-

cularly of the Socinians, than to the Antient Doctrine of the Church collected from the Word of God.

And indeed if it were not that I hope I may contribute ſomething to clear the Notions of Sacraments to Vulgar Capacities, and convince them of the Neceſſity of frequenting them, which I find the Socinian Notions (too much encouraged by ſome) have very much ſhaken, I ſhould think what I have before ſaid alone ſufficient to Anſwer Mr. *B*'s. whole Diſcourſe concerning them, and to ſhew it to be of no force.

But whilſt Men are made to look on Sacraments as primarily deſigned to bind us to our Duty to God, and not rather as Pledges and Conveyances of his grace to us, they are apt to be deterr'd by having their Duty ſet before them in ſo ſtrong, and the grace to perform it in ſo weak a light; whereas if Men look on them principally as tenders of grace and aſſiſtance to perform their Duty better and more eaſily than they did before, and conſider this as the proper and peculiar effect of them as Sacraments, and that which diſtinguiſhes them from all other Signs (as I have and ſhall prove it is) this will encourage them to come to them cheerfully, and bind themſelves readily to that Duty which they here hope for grace to Diſcharge; In which hopes God will not deceive them. But Mr. *B.* has ſo ordered the matter that he has perverted moſt of thoſe Scriptures that give us this hope and aſſurance, to a quite different purpoſe; So that in the relation I ſtand towards you, I am obliged to inſtruct you in the Orthodox ſenſe of them, and vindicate them from the Socinian gloſſes he thus puts on them.

I proceed therefore, Firſt, To ſhew you *That the Sacraments are primarily ſigns of God's Grace, and not properly of our Duty, tho' they imply it.* This I think neceſſary to do, to make you underſtand the true Nature of Sacraments; For otherwiſe I muſt let you know it is not neceſſary to the point in diſpute about the Sign of the Croſs; for whether the Sacraments are immediately Signs of our Duty or no, it is plain (as I ſhall ſhew you in the Second Place) *That the Scripture Warrants us to uſe other ſigns of our duty beſides them.* And (in in the Third Place) That the *Croſs is ſuch a ſign as the Scriptures Warrant,*

Sect.

Sect. II.

That the Sacraments are Primarily Signs from God to us of his Grace; and not properly of our Duty, either as required by God, or profeſt by us; tho' they imply it.

I. THis is plainly the Doctrine of our Church in her Catechiſm and Articles: In the firſt She Teaches that a *Sacrament is an Outward and Viſible Sign of an Inward and Spiritual Grace given unto us by God*, reſtraining the Sign to this *Grace* of God. And in her Articles She declares that *Sacraments be not only badges or tokens of Chriſtians Profeſſion, but* rather *they be certain ſure Witneſſes and Effectual Signs of Grace and God's good will towards us, by which he doth work inviſible in us*, Art. 25. And again, *Baptiſm is not only a ſign of Profeſſion and mark of difference whereby Chriſtian Men are diſcerned from others that be not Chriſtened, but it is alſo a Sign of Regeneration or new birth whereby as by an Inſtrument, they that receive Baptiſm rightly are grafted into the Church*, &c. Art. 27. And further *The Supper of the Lord is not only a ſign of the love that Chriſtians ought to have amongſt themſelves one to another but* rather *it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Chriſt's Death; inſomuch that to ſuch as rightly, worthily, and with Faith receive the ſame: The Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Chriſt*, &c. Art. 28. In all which places, our Church makes the Grace of God (effectually Communicated to us in the due uſe of the Sacraments) to be properly and principally ſignified by them. To theſe Articles I ſuppoſe you do aſſent, they being approved by the *Heads of Agreement* which Mr. *B.* aſſerts to be the *Common Principles wherein both* the Presbyterian and Congregational *Divines are agreed*, *Rem. p.* 142.

II. Beſides this Authority of our Church, I think moſt Divines that have Written to purpoſe on this Subject, diſtinguiſh between the things *Signified* by a Sacramental *Sign*: The things *Pre-required* in us to the uſe of it; and the *Benefits*, *Conſequents* and *Effects* of it. Thus in the Lord's-Supper, the things properly and immediately *Signified* are the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which are therein communicated to us. The things *Pre-required* in us are, *to Examin our ſelves, to have a lively ſenſe of God's Mercy in Chriſt; to have a thankful remembrance of his Death, and be in Charity with all men.* Theſe are the Wedding Garments that make us acceptable Gueſts at this Feaſt.

Laſtly,

Laſtly, the *Benefit* or *Effect* of this Sacrament is, *The refreſhing our Souls by the Body and Blood of Chriſt, as our Bodys are by the Bread and Wine.* I might inſtance the ſame in the other Sacrament of Baptiſm, But an Example will make it plainer for both,

We will ſuppoſe then a King grants a Pardon to a Rebel under the Great Seal. Now the Great Seal, in this caſe ſignifies (as every body knows) the King's Favour and Grace to the perſon to whom it is granted; this is the direct proper and immediate ſignification of it. But it is ſuppoſed or *pre-required* that the perſon ſo favoured is willing to accept of the Pardon granted by it, and that he is reſolved to be a faithful Subject for the future. The *Conſequent* of this Pardon is, that he who has it ſhall enjoy his Liberty, Eſtate and Life as formerly.

Now if any ſhou'd argue from this that the Great Seal is a ſign of our Submiſſion and Allegiance, and of the enjoyment of our Liberty, Property, *&c.* it would be in effect the ſame as if they ſhou'd ſay that a red Sky at Evening in Harveſt (which properly ſignifies a fair day to follow) is a Sign of the Obligations which Husbandmen lie under to imploy their diligence in the Seaſon offered, to preſerve the Fruits of the Earth, and of full Barns and increaſe of Wealth; becauſe theſe are all Antecedents or Conſequents of the fair Day which ſuch a Sky properly and immediately ſignifies.

III. Mr. *B.* in oppoſition to this Doctrine, takes ſome pains to prove the Sacraments deſigned to repreſent our Duty to us, and to ſignify our Obligation to perform it, and applys ſeveral places of Scripture to this intent, but I deſire you to obſerve that the thing Mr. *B.* ought to prove is, that they are Signs from us to God, for tho they repreſent our Duty to us, they may ſtill be Signs from God to us ſignifying his Will requiring us to perform ſuch Duties, and not from us to God ſignifying our Intention and Reſolution to perform them, for it is neceſſary carefully to diſtinguiſh between God's ſignifying his Will to us by certain Signs, which require or repreſent our Duty and our profeſſing Obedience to him in ſuch ſignificant Actions as are proper to expreſs it. The former, God doth in many Types and Signs in the Old and New Teſtament, beſides the Sacraments which ſignify them only by Conſequence and Implication not directly; and the latter we do in every Act of Outward Devotion ſuch as Bowing, Kneeling, Standing, putting on Sackcloth, *&c.* all which repreſent our Duty, and are profeſſions of our Intentions to perform it.

Tho'

Tho' therefore Mr. *B.* ſhould prove by Scripture that the Sacraments repreſent our Duty as required by God, yet it were nothing againſt me, except he prove it to be proper and peculiar to Sacraments to repreſent our Duty as profeſt by us to the Excluſion of all other Signs.

However, tho' I need not take Notice of the Scriptures he produces to this purpoſe, they not being to the point in hand, yet becauſe they are all perverted from their true and genuine ſenſe I think my ſelf obliged to Vindicate them from his falſe gloſſes, and ſhall with them likewiſe conſider his other Arguments on this Head.

The firſt is, *John* 3. 5. *Except a Man be born of the Water and the Holy Ghoſt he cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven.* This he produces *Vind.* 38. to prove that *Waſhing with Water is by its Reſemblance Inſtructive to us concerning the Priviledges and Duties of the Covenant we enter into.* But here is nothing concerning Inſtruction; but the plain and litteral meaning of the place is, That Baptiſm repreſents to us the Will of God to give us a New Birth by Water and the Holy Ghoſt. The Water doth not only Inſtruct us in the *Neceſſity of the Regenerating and purifying Vertue of the Holy Spirit*, as he ſeems to ſuggeſt, but when duly uſed, it carries that Vertue along with it.

The ſecond place produced by him to prove the Water in Baptiſm to be an Inſtructing Sign concerning our Duty and Priviledges, is, *Tit* 3. 5. *He ſaved us by the Waſhing of Regeneration and Renewing of the Holy Ghoſt.* This fully proves that it is God's Inſtitution, that we ſhou'd be ſaved by Water and the Holy Ghoſt in Baptiſm: If Mr. *B.* thinks that we are only Inſtructed in that Priviledge by the Water in Baptiſm, as he ſeems to do, he contradicts the very Letter of the Holy Scripture, which ſays we are ſaved by it, and he ſeems to be influenced in this point with Socinian Notions.

The third place is *Acts* 22. 16. *Ariſe be Baptiſed, and waſh away thy ſins.* This he produces to prove that Baptiſm is *Deſigned to Inſtruct us concerning our guilt as well as pollution, and the neceſſity of our being cleanſed from it by the laver of our Mediators blood.* But ſure the place proves quite another thing; not only that we are Inſtructed by Baptiſm concerning the neceſſity of being Cleanſed, but that we are actually Cleanſed and Waſhed in our Mediators Blood by it, and have our Sins then, and not before, forgiven us: So the Scriptures frequently Teach us, and ſo the Church has ever underſtood it: It

is not for any Merit of our Faith or Repentance that our Sins are forgiven us, and therefore God may as juſtly, and has as poſitively made Baptiſm a condition of our pardon when it may be had, as either of them. Chriſt may apply the Vertue of his blood to us on what terms he pleaſes, and ſince he has made Baptiſm a Condition, the meaneſs of the thing ought to be no Exception, any more than the waſhing in *Jordon* was a juſt Exception to *Namaan* the *Syrian*. We are therefore as much regenerated by Baptiſm, Cleanſed, Saved and pardoned by it, as *Namaan* was Cured of his Leproſy by Waſhing in *Jordon*: And can no more be partakers of theſe benefits without it, when we may have it, then he cou'd without the other. It is therefore of very ill conſequence to interpret theſe places of bare Inſtruction, and I hope Mr. *B.* will not ſay he meant ſo to interpret them to Exclude the real force and efficacy.

The fourth place is *John* 6. 53, 54. *Whoſo eats my fleſh, and drinks my blood hath Eternal Life* —— *For my Fleſh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed.* This he produces to prove that in the Lords Supper *There is not only a Commemorative Repreſentation of the Death of Chriſt, but alſo an Inſtructive Repreſentation of our ſpiritual Communion with him in his Body and Blood.* And of *Thoſe Duties* —— *by which we are ſaid to Eat his Fleſh and Drink his Blood, Vind. p.* 39. But there is no colour for ſuch a gloſs. The Place ſpeaks of feeding by Faith on the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, either in or out of the Sacrament.

'Tis certain and confeſſed by the Church of God that there is a peculiar Feeding on the Body and Blood of Chriſt by worthy Receivers in the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper; and that there is not only a *Commemorative* and *Inſtructive* Repreſentation of them, as Mr. *B.* alledges, but a real and true Communion of them; your Confeſſion of Faith uſes the Words *Really* and *Indeed*, *Chap.* 29. and therefore it is great perverting of thoſe Words of St. *John* to interpret them of ſuch Commemorative and Inſtructive Repreſentation only, and a ready way to bring in the Socinian Notions of Sacraments.

The Fifth place, *Vind. p.* 39. is, *Rom.* 6. 3. 4. 5. *So many of us as were Baptiſed into Chriſt, were Baptiſed into his Death, therefore we are Buried with him by Baptiſm unto Death: that like as Chriſt was Raiſed up from the Dead by the Glory of the Father, even ſo we alſo ſhou'd walk in Newneſs of Life.* He alledges (*Vind. p.* 39.) *That dying unto Sin,*

and

and walking in Newneſs of Life is not ſignifyed as the Benefit Conferred by God (as I ſuppoſe) but rather as the Duty required from us. And to the ſame purpoſe he quotes *Colloſſ.* 2. 12. *Buried with him in Baptiſm, wherein alſo you are riſen with him* —— *and you being dead in your ſins, and the uncircumciſion of your fleſh hath he quickned together with him, having forgiven you all treſpaſſes.* It is manifeſt from the plain Words of theſe places, that the Apoſtle here ſhews what God has done for us, and from thence infers what we owe to him: He has mortified Sin in us by Baptiſm, he has buried us with Chriſt, he has forgiven us all Treſpaſſes, he has quickened us together with him as he raiſed Chriſt, and given us a new Life by his Holy Spirit; let any one judge whether theſe are Benefits we receive from God, as I affirm, or rather *Duties required from us*, as Mr. *B.* alledges. Every one of theſe (as the Church of God has ever Taught, and as the generality of Chriſtians, except *Pelagians* of old and *Socinians* of late, have profeſſed to believe) are Acts of God's efficacious Spirit upon us, and not Duties required of us, tho' they infer Duties to be perform'd by us. We cannot quicken our ſelves, or kill Sin in us till the Spirit of God deliver us from the Body of Death, and quicken us by a new Principle, and then when he has given us a New Life, it is (as the Apoſtle infers) our Duty to walk in the *Newneſs of* that *Life.* This is plainly the Apoſtles Reaſoning, *Rom.* 6. for after he hath ſhewed what God has done for us, in giving us his Grace to mortify our Luſts, and to enliven us with Chriſt, he concludes *V.* 12. *Let not therefore Sin reign in your Mortal Body, that you ſhould obey it in the Luſts thereof.*

The Sixth place he produces is, 1. *Cor.* 6. 11. *But ye are Waſhed, but you are Sanctified, but you are Juſtified, in the Name of the Lord Jeſus.* He alledges that theſe Expreſſions refer to Baptiſm, which is true; but that is our Duty to Waſh, to Sanctify, to Juſtify our ſelves rather than receive them as Benefits from God, is not to be allowed. Theſe are acts of God's Spirit upon us; in Baptiſm we expect and receive them from him, and when we have received them it is then our Duty to imploy the Grace he has beſtowed on us, leſt we receive it in vain, and this obligation to improve the Talent God has given us in Baptiſm, is a clear Conſequence from his having ſo freely given it to us.

The Seventh place Mr. *B.* urges to prove that *Baptiſm is a Sign from us to God, of our Obligations to the Duties of his Covenant*, is,

1. *Pet.*

1. *Pet.* 3. 25. *Baptiſm doth alſo now ſave us (not the putting away of the filth of the fleſh, but the anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God)* I think this is ſo far from proving what Mr. *B.* produces it for, that it proves the direct contrary. Our Saviour tells us that *he who Believes and is Baptiſed ſhall be ſaved*; that is Faith and Baptiſm are the means or conditions of our Salvation; Baptiſm is God's Act by his Miniſters, and Faith is ours (that is, the Act of it tho' the Gift and Grace be his) but except we perform our part, Baptiſm will do us no ſervice; nor ought the Miniſters who are the diſpenſers of God's Favours, to admit us to it, till we ſatisfy them ſome other way of our Sincerity than meerly by our demanding Baptiſm: Therefore the Apoſtles requir'd a ſolemn profeſſion of Faith, Repentance and Obedience from ſuch as were to be Baptiſed, and Obliged them to anſwer ſuch Queſtions as the Church has ever put to thoſe that came to Baptiſm, till your Directory threw them out. Now this clearly proves that Baptiſm doth not directly and immediatly ſignify our Duty or Obligation to God, ſince another rite was added to ſignify that, even a ſolemn Profeſſion of our Faith and Reſolution that we would forſake the Devil and his Works, believe in God and keep his Commandments, expreſſed by ſolemn Anſwers to ſeveral Queſtions. Theſe Anſwers bind and oblige us to our Duty to God before we can be Baptiſed; and then comes Baptiſm, which is God's act, by which he pardons our Sins and Adopts us as Sons; or as our Church expreſſes it, grants us *A death unto Sin, and a new birth unto Righteouſneſs.* And the not obſerving this ſeems to me the reaſon of that great omiſſion in your Directory, of which I took notice, *Admonition p.* 56. That *No expreſs Covenant is Ordered to be made in the Name of the Child Baptized, either by the Parent or any elſe.* For the Authors of the Directory having determined that Sacraments are Inſtituted *Solemnly* to engage Church Members *Into the Service of God in Chriſt* (*Confeſſion of Faith, Chap.* 27.) it will follow on Mr. *B*'s. principles, (which ſeem in this point to be the ſame with theirs) that it is unlawful to demand another Engagement of thoſe that are to be Baptized, or that they ſhou'd by another rite, that is by Solemnly Anſwering certain Queſtions, dedicate themſelves to the Service of Chriſt; becauſe as he Argues (*Vind. p.* 52.) It *is a needleſs doing that over again by a Rite of our own deviſing, which is ſufficiently done by a Rite of Chriſt's Inſtitution.* And therefore the Directory only Orders the Miniſter before Baptiſm to *Uſe ſome words of Inſtruction touching the Inſtitution, Nature and Ends*

of

of this Sacrament: But doth not require any Profeſſion or Engagement from thoſe that are to be Baptiſed, or in their Name, or any anſwer ſignifying their conſent, vow or reſolution to believe and ſerve Chriſt, quite contrary to St. *Peter*, who tells us in effect, that Baptiſm will not ſave us without this *Anſwer of a good Conſcience*. I think this one place is ſufficient to ſhew us that we are obliged by other means then meer accepting the Sign of Baptiſm, and that the thing that directly binds our Duty on us is our ſolemn Profeſſion of our Faith and Duty, which we muſt ſignify by ſuch ſigns and means as are proper to ſignify our ſincerity in other Caſes; And that Baptiſm doth not ſignify thoſe, but ſuppoſeth them; the whole deſign of that being to entitle us to God's Grace and Favours upon ſuppoſition that we are qualified for them. Mr. *B.* indeed objects that Baptiſm is the *Solemnizing a mutual Covenant between the bleſſed God on the one part*, and *us on the other*; and therefore *it is firſt a Sign from us to God, of our conſent to the proper terms of his Covenant, before it can be a Sign from him to us* of our Intereſt in thoſe benefits. If this were ſo then there needed no other Sign of our conſent beſides the uſe of Baptiſm; but St *Peter* ſhews us the contrary, that we are to ſignify our conſent by other means, even by a Solemn Profeſſion, and taking on us expreſly thoſe Obligations that are the propoſed Conditions of the Covenant; and when we have bound our ſelves by this Rite and Solemn Profeſſion, and declared our conſent to thoſe Terms, then and not before we are admitted to Baptiſm for the remiſſion of Sins.

8*thly*. He further argues from St. *Mark* 1. 4. where Baptiſm is called the *Baptiſm of Repentance for the Remiſſion of Sins*: That it is, *Firſt*, *A Sign of our Repentance towards God, before it can be a Sign from him of the Remiſſion of Sins*, p. 41. But the meaning is plainly, that *John* preached Remiſſion of Sins by Baptiſm on Condition Men repented: And the Queſtion is here whether Baptiſm ſignified that the Men Repented, or that God wou'd forgive the Penitent when Baptized; If the laſt be the meaning, then it is a Sign altogether from God to us; But if the Firſt, then it is indeed a Sign from Men to God. But it cannot be ſo, is clear, becauſe Repentance was firſt to be ſignified by other Signs, ſuch as Confeſſion of Sins, promiſe of Amendment, *&c.* before the Perſons were to be Baptiſed, and therefore Baptiſm did not ſignify, but ſuppoſe Repentance. I do own there is a Covenant made between us and God in Baptiſm: We promiſe Faith and Obedience, and ſignify them by a Solemn Pro-

 feſſion

feſſion, and other Signs: God gives us his Spirit for Remiſſion of Sins, and a new Birth; and this is ſignified by Baptiſm, which is the Sign and means that Conveys them.

9thly. He produces, *Gal.* 5. 3. *Every Man that is Circumciſed is a Debtor to the whole Law, Vind. p.* 42. I anſwer that every Man that accepts the King's Pardon and Protection under the Great Seal is obliged to be a good Subject, and keep the Laws; yet it doth not follow, as I have already ſhewed, that the King's great Seal is a Sign from us to the King, but ſolely from him to us

10thly. He argues (*Vind. p.* 41.) that Baptiſm was called a Sacrament becauſe it *was reckoned (like the Military Oath of the Roman Soldiers) as a ſolemn liſting of the Perſon Baptized into the Service and Warfare of Chriſt.* To this I anſwer, Firſt, That the ſame Perſons that call Baptiſm and the Lords-Supper *Sacraments* on this Account, do likewiſe call ſeveral other Rites *Sacraments*; And therefore, in their Opinion, to bind and oblige our ſelves to our Duty was not peculiar to thoſe Signs, which we now only call *Sacraments*. Secondly, I own there is ſuch an Oath made at Baptiſm, which binds and obliges us to be Faithful; and thereupon we are admitted by Baptiſm into the Number and Priviledges of Chriſt's Soldiers: But Baptiſm ſignifies God's act admitting us, not ours, any other way then by Conſequence and Suppoſition: And therefore we may make many ſuch Vows beſide what we make at Baptiſm and ſignify them by ſuch Signs as are proper, without any offence; if we ſhould do it by Writing and Sealing it were no harm; which wou'd both be binding and obliging Signs on our parts, yet no Sacraments, or ſinfull human Inventions, any more than the Croſs.

11thly, He argues, *p.* 42. That Sacrifices were Covenanting Rites, and quotes, *Pſal.* 50. 5. *Gather my Saints together, thoſe that have made a Covenant with me by Sacrifice.* To which I anſwer there were two things in Sacrifices: Firſt, The offering of them to God as a Sign of our Homage and Duty, which we owe him, as we pay Tribute to the King; And this was the Offerers Act, and fully ſignified his Duty. And then there was God's admitting the Offerer to feed on them after they were made his, and this was God's Act and a Sign of his Favour and Reconciliation to the Perſon.

Therefore Sacrifices were Signs of our Duty to God, as well as of his Favour to us, but the caſe is otherwiſe in Baptiſm and the Lord's-Supper; the offering that reconciles us to God, was made by Chriſt,

not

not by us; and we are reconcil'd by vertue of that: and the Sacraments do only apply to us the Waſhing or Propitiation of Chriſt's Blood, and feed us as reconcil'd Gueſts on his Body; and therefore are wholly Signs from God to us, and other Signs are neceſſary on our part to ſignify our Duty. And therefore the primitive Chriſtians brought meat and drink for a common Feaſt at the Lord's-Supper, to ſignify the ſincerity of their Love, and Teſtify it to the World; and we do yet Offer part of our Subſtance for the Relief of God's Servants at this Sacrament: both which are Signs as well as Inſtances of our Duty; and plainly ſhew that our Duty is not ſo ſignified in the Sacraments, but other Signs are neceſſary on our part. And if a man who came to demand Baptiſm, ſhou'd as a Sign and Token of his Reſolution to renounce the Devil the World and Fleſh give a large Portion of his Subſtance to ſome Charitable uſe, it were very lawful for him to uſe this Sign, and no affront to Baptiſm, as if it were not ſufficient to ſignify our Duty and Obligation to God: And ſuch an act would be a very acceptable Sacrifice to him.

12*thly*, He urges, *Acts*, 2. 38. *Then Peter ſaid unto them, Repent, and be Baptiſed every one of you in the Name of Chriſt, for the remiſſion of Sins, and ye ſhall receive the Holy Ghoſt, for the Promiſe is unto you and to your Children.* Whence he infers, That *they were by Baptiſm firſt to profeſs their Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jeſus, and then receive the promiſed Benefit,* Remiſſion of Sins, *Vind p.* 41. But here is not one word of profeſſing Repentance by Baptiſm, nor can any ſuch thing be inferred from the Words; but on the contrary, they prove that the Sins of the Penitents are remitted by Baptiſm, and they intitled to the Promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt; the granting both which are Acts of God's Favour beſtowed on us in Baptiſm. If Baptiſm were deſigned to profeſs or ſignify our Repentance directly, there needed no other Profeſſion or Signs of Repentance, according to Mr. *B.* becaule the Sign appointed by God would be ſufficient; but no Miniſter ought to Baptize any, till by a ſolemn Profeſſion before, and other Signs and Tokens, they ſatisfy him in ſome meaſure of the ſincerity of their Faith and Repentance, as I have already ſhewed.

13*thly*, He alledges our Saviours Command to Baptize, *Mat.* 28. *v.* 19. *Go ye therefore and Teach all Nations Baptiſing them*, &c. This Command he ſays (*Vind. p.* 41.) plainly *implies that one great uſe of Baptiſm was to be a ſolemn Bond upon them, to the Duty of that Chriſtian Profeſſion*

Profeſſion they had imbraced, and the Baptiſing them In the Name of the Father, &c. *has been always ſuppoſed to imply a ſolemn Dedication of them by this Sacred Rite to the Faith, Worſhip and Service of the Bleſſed Trinity.* But I anſwer that the plain meaning of theſe words is, that Chriſt gives his Apoſtles power to admit Diſciples by Baptiſm, into the Priviledge of being Taught by the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, as their Maſters and Law-givers. The Queſtion is whether Baptiſm ſignifies God's admitting us to this Priviledge, or our chuſing him for our Lord and Maſter: That is, whether it ſignifies God's Act or ours. I think it eaſy to determine this Queſtion, ſince it is manifeſt that Faith and Repentance, which include our Submitting our ſelves to God, are Qualifications required to Baptiſm, and the perſon that demands it muſt ſatisfy the Miniſters of the Sacraments, that he is ſincere in his Submiſſion by ſuch Signs and Profeſſion of Repentance, and Faith as are proper to ſignify them, before they ought to admit him. I own Baptiſm is a Bond, and dedicates us to God's Service; but it is a Bond laid on us by God, who requires Faith and Repentance of thoſe that are Baptiſed, and ſets them apart and Conſecrates them to his peculiar Service, and to the Priviledges that attend and are promiſed to ſuch.

14*thly*, He produces, 1. *Tim.* 2, 19. *Nevertheleſs the Foundation* (or Covenant) *of God ſtands ſure, having this Seal* (on God's part) *the Lord knows them that are his*, and (this Seal on our part, as he alledges) *Let him that names the Name of Chriſt depart from iniquity.* From whence he infers, *As the Covenant is mutual, ſo the external Rite is intended to ratify our Reſtipulation as well as Gods promiſe.* But I anſwer, this place proves that the Covenant of God requires, on our part, a Duty, *to depart from iniquity*, as well as it includes a Promiſe that God *knows who are his* (that is, will Own, Proteſt and Reward them) but that the Sacraments are our Seals to this Covenant cannot be inferred from thence: The Covenant it ſelf is a meer Favour and Grace vouchſafed us by God, and we muſt take it in nature of a Grant from him, on what Conditions and under what Seal he pleaſes; and accordingly he has put the Sacraments (the Seals thereof) into the hands of his Miniſters, who are his Officers (or as we may call them his Chancellors) to diſpence his Pardon and Favours to thoſe that are qualified for them. Our buſineſs is therefore to qualify our ſelves, and then apply to his Officers that are duly appointed by him for the Seals of our Pardon; and we are

to

to ſatisfy them by proper Signs of our Sincerity, before they ought to ſeal this pardon to us. The Sacraments therefore are God's Seals, not ours, diſpenſed by his lawful appointed Officers, not by our Deputies or Miniſters, which do indeed imply and ſuppoſe a Duty from us, but are not immediately appointed to Signify that Duty, or that we reſolve or ingage to perform it, but that God will accept of us if we do, and to do which accordingly, they lay the ſtricteſt Obligations on us, by way of Conſequence.

Laſtly, He urges my own words againſt me, that I allow in my Diſcourſe *p.* 4. That in the Sacraments *We not only expreſs our dependance on God for his Grace, but likewiſe oblige and bind our ſelves to ſerve him.* (Now ſaith he) *How this can be true without making the Sacramental Rite a Sign from us to God, of that obligation to his Service, I cannot comprehend.*

In Anſwer to this when I ſay that we expreſs our Dependance on God for his Grace in the Sacraments and oblige our ſelves to ſerve him, I mean that our coming to the Sacraments is an effect of our Faith and Dependance on God, and a Declaration to the World that we reſolve to ſerve him, as he has required thoſe to do who expect he ſhou'd fullfil the promiſes that he has made to worthy Receivers: But that therefore the Sacraments are properly or purpoſely or principally Inſtituted to ſignify theſe acts of ours, doth no ways follow; or that it is proper to Sacraments as ſuch to do ſo: And there needs no more to convince any reaſonable Man of this, but to remember that we do expreſs this Dependance on God, and Obligation to ſerve him by every act of Worſhip, as well as by the Sacraments; And therefore this uſe can be no ways peculiar to them: And for any to confound the things *Pre-required* on our part to our uſe of the Sacraments, or the *Effects* and *Benefits* of them, with what is directly and properly *Signified* by the Signs, is very unreaſonable, and a ſign that the Perſon, who doth ſo, either doth not underſtand their Nature, or has a mind to keep up a Diſpute. Mr. *B.* may alledge this is New, but it is plainly the Doctrine of our Church, as I have ſhewed, and is founded on Reaſon and Scripture.

Suppoſe from the inſtance I have before given, any ſhou'd Argue that the Great Seal is a Sign from us of ſubmitting to the King, and of Obedience to him; and that therefore to ſhew our Obedience or Gratititude to the King by any other Sign, were Treaſon and a taking on us to counterfeit to the Kings Seal; wou'd

not ſuch a Man be looked on as a very unreaſonable Diſputant? And yet this I take to be exactly the Caſe between Mr. *B.* and Me: We both agree (I ſuppoſe) that Sacraments are Signs of ſome Inward and Spiritual Grace, which only God can give us; and that he has promiſed theſe to us in the due uſe of the Sacraments. But then it is pre-ſuppoſed and required that we uſe them duly, and be qualified as God requireth; From whence Mr. *B.* infers that the Sacraments ſignify thoſe Qualifications and Diſpoſitions in us that they pre-ſuppoſe and require: And therefore to ſignify them by any other Signs is to make a *New Human Sacrament*, which is in effect to counterfeit the Broad Seal of Heaven. But I ſay that to do this is no more to make a Human Sacrament, than to ſignify by ſuch other Signs as are uſual and proper to expreſs ſuch Diſpoſitions of mind in other Caſes, my acceptance of the Kings Pardon, and my Reſolution to Acknowledge his Mercy to me in granting it, is to make a New Pardon for my Self, or to counterfeit the Kings Seal. From whence you may ſee how *We expreſs our Dependance on God for his Grace*, and *oblige our ſelves to ſerve him* in the Sacraments, without making the Sacramental *Rite* properly or primarily a Sign from us to God, much leſs principally or peculiarly; which is the only thing wou'd do Mr. *B*'s. Cauſe any ſervice in this Caſe. For if other Signs ſignify theſe, as well as the Sacraments, it is plain they do not belong to the Sacraments as ſuch; and I have already ſhewed that the Sacraments were not deſigned properly or principally for this end, nor are they ſufficient for it; ſince God has thought fit to appoint other Signs for this purpoſe, and Warranted us to uſe ſuch words and actions beſide them as by general cuſtom are proper. And I can ſee no more harm in uſing other Signs, beſides the Sacramental, to expreſs our Duty, and acknowledgments to God when we Celebrate them, than in uſing other words than Chriſt appointed in the Inſtitution. The Argument is full as ſtrong againſt the uſe of the one as of the other; For if the Sacramental Signs be ſufficient to this purpoſe, the words are likewiſe ſufficient. And then to add New words of our own to the ſame purpoſe for which God appointed the words of Inſtitution, is as much to accuſe his Inſtitution of Imperfection, as to add New Signs. Yet I ſuppoſe it is no harm to add ſuch words as may make Receivers underſtand the Nature and uſes of theſe Myſteries; or expreſs their Faith and ſenſe of God's favour, and the gratitude they have for it. And then I ſuppoſe there is as little harm

harm in expreſſing the ſame by ſuch Signs as common Cuſtom has made ſignificant thereof as by Words; Both being Warranted by God in Scripture. And whereas Mr. *B.* alledges (*Vind. p.* 46.) *That it belongs to God alone to appoint the Religious Rites whereby we bind our ſelves to his Service as to the Supreme Magiſtrate to appoint the Ceremonies uſed in our taking the Oath of Allegiance:* I anſwer that it belongs much more to the Supreme Magiſtrate to preſcribe the words of the Oath, than the Ceremonies; And it is much more Penal to add or take away from the words of the Oath, or to change them, than to add to the Ceremonies preſcribed in taking it; for that is often no fault at all, and therefore to add to the words of Inſtitution any of our own, will be more Penal than to add to the Ceremonies. This whole Objection therefore about a *Human Sacrament*, is a meer amuſement of Words: For if a Human Sacrament ſignify any thing that is Criminal, it muſt ſignify our pretending a Divine Inſtitution for a Rite of our own Contriving, and aſſigning a Divine effect to it: This is indeed to counterfeit God's Seal, and a great Sin. But to ſignify our Duty to God by a Rite that properly expreſſes it, is no more to be called a *Human Sacrament* than Writing a profeſſion of Loyalty to the King, or entering into a Recognizance for our good Behaviour, and Sealing it with our own Seal, is a counterfeiting of his.

And whereas Mr. *B.* alledges, *Vind. p.* 43. That to make a Sign a *Seal on our part*, is to make it a *part of Religious Worſhip* and a *Sinful Human Invention.* I anſwer, That we ought to diſtinguiſh between the proper Acts or Parts of Divine Worſhip, and the Manner or Means of Expreſſing thoſe Acts, only God can appoint a proper Act or Part of Worſhip, but the Manner or Means of Expreſſing it, is often left to us, and is to be determined by our preſent Circumſtances. Thus appearing in God's Preſence with Reverence, Humility and Submiſſion is an Act of Worſhip directly required by the Holy Scriptures, but to Expreſs this Humility and Submiſſion by Uncovering our Heads, is not particularly there Required; but in as much as univerſal Cuſtom amongſt us (for it is otherwiſe in other places of the World) has made this an Expreſſion of this Diſpoſition of our Minds when we appear before our Superiors, therefore we uſe it in our appearance before God, without making it a proper part of Worſhip or a Human Sacrament. And ſo on the ſame account, God requires that Women ſhou'd appear before him with Modeſty, and a due ſenſe of their inferiority to Men, as I ſhewed in my Diſcourſe,

Chap 4. *S.* 2. *p.* 2. And in as much as univerſal Cuſtom had in the Apoſtles time made a Vail a mark of Womens ſubjection to Men, & it was Immodeſt for them to appear Unvailed in Publick places, therefore the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 11. requires that they be Vailed in the Chriſtian Aſſemblies, which yet did not make this Vailing themſelves a part of Divine Worſhip, nor a Sacrament, and therefore amongſt us, where this Cuſtom doth not obtain, the Vailing of Women in the Church is laid aſide: and by parity of Reaſon confeſſing Chriſt Crucified and Glorying in his Suffering on the Croſs, is a part of Worſhip, which univerſal Cuſtom of all Churches and Ages has taught us to Expreſs by making the Sign of the Croſs: But Expreſſing this Act of Worſhip by this Means and in this Manner, doth no more make it a part of Divine Worſhip, or a Human Sacrament, or a Sealing the Covenant on our part then Expreſſing our Reverence and Submiſſion by Uncovering the Head (or Feet where that is Cuſtomary) makes thoſe parts of Divine Worſhip, or Vailing Women to ſignify their Modeſty and Subjection, makes it a Human Sacrament. I might add many other like Inſtances from Scripture, but ſhall content my ſelf with one, which we find, 2 *Kings*, 19. *v.* 14. where *Hezekiah* receives a Letter full of Blaſphemies againſt God; upon the receit of this Letter he *went up into the Houſe of God and ſpread it before the Lord.* And with this ſignificant Action offers up his Prayer to God. It is the Cuſtom for perſons that have received a Threatning Letter that reflecteth on their Lord or Friend, to carry it to him who is concerned, and lay it before him, as an effectual means to ſtir him up to Juſtify himſelf, and to Protect thoſe that depend on him, and doing ſo, is a Sign of Fidelity and Dependance in the perſon that thus makes the Application: Therefore *Hezekiah ſpread the Letter before the Lord*, thereby Expreſſing his Faith, Truſt and Reſignation to God, which are proper acts of Worſhip, and particularly required at our Hands, but to do this by ſpreading a Letter is no where particularly Commanded, yet it was accepted by God. *Hezekiah's* doing it, was no introduction of any Invention of Men into God's Worſhip, nor was it a *Human Sacrament*, yet it was uſed to the ſame purpoſe that we uſe the Sign of the Croſs, which ſignifies no more then our Faith, Truſt and Dependance on a Crucified Saviour, and a Reſignation to his Service, which is all that is meant in the Thirtieth Canon of the Church of *England*, by our Dedication to God. *Hezekiah* therefore did as much Dedicate himſelf to God's Service by

ſpreading

ſpreading the Letter before God, as we do by making the Sign of the Croſs: and the one is as well Warranted as the other, and is as far from being a Sacrament.

Sect. III.

That the Scriptures Warrant us to uſe other Signs that are not Sacraments, for the ſeveral uſes aſcribed to Sacraments by Mr. B. ſo far as the Sign of the Croſs is concerned in thoſe uſes.

I. BEfore I proceed to the direct proof of this, I muſt obſerve that the Words wherein Mr. *B.* expreſſes the uſes and ends of Sacraments are not clear or certain, but admit of ſeveral Senſes; in ſome of which they expreſs indeed the proper uſes of Sacraments; but in others only thoſe uſes that belong to other Signs, as well as to Sacraments: And therefore it will be neceſſary to conſider apart each of theſe uſes laid down by him, which he reduces to three General Heads, namely, *Repreſenting*, *Obliging* and *Diſtinguiſhing*, and to explain to you the ſeveral Senſes of which they are capable.

After this I ſhall prove that the Sign of the Croſs is not a *Repreſenting*, *Obliging* or *Diſtinguiſhing* Sign, in any of thoſe Senſes which expreſs the proper uſes of Sacraments, and that in thoſe Senſes in which the Croſs is a *Repreſenting*, *Obliging* or *Diſtinguiſhing* Sign the Scriptures Warrant other Signs, that are not Sacraments, for the ſame uſes.

Signs then I ſay, may be called *Repreſenting*, *Obliging* and *Diſtinguiſhing* upon ſeveral accounts and in ſeveral ſenſes, particularly in theſe following.

Firſt, A Sign may be called a *Repreſenting Sign* becauſe it ſignifies to us God's conferring on us and conveying to us certain Graces, Favours or Priviledges repreſented to us in and by the Sign. So the King's Charter to a Corporation, ſignifies the King's pleaſure, that they ſhould enjoy certain Priviledges and Immunities. Mr. *B.* owns this Senſe of *Repreſenting* Signs, when he ſays that Sacraments are *Repreſenting Signs for Inſtruction in the Priviledges of the New Covenant*, that is as I ſuppoſe (the words are intended to mean) that Sacraments repreſent to us or inſtruct us, that it is the will and pleaſure of God that we ſhould enjoy thoſe Priviledges.

2*dly*, A Sign may be called *Repreſenting* becauſe it ſignifies God's

Pleaſure and Command concerning ſome Duties ſet forth and repreſented by the Sign, which God would have us perform: Thus the King's Charter doth not only ſignify the Priviledges and Immunities granted to a City, but likewiſe the Offices and Duties the King requires from ſuch as enjoy thoſe Priviledges. And this Senſe of Repreſenting Signs is owned by Mr. *B.* in (what I ſuppoſe he means by) *Sacraments being Inſtructive in the Duties of the New Covenant*; which Duties, imply our natural *Guilt*, *Pollution* and *Weakneſs*, and *the neceſſity of being cleanſed from them.*

3*dly*, A Sign may be called *Repreſenting*, becauſe it ſignifies our Deſire, Purpoſe and Reſolution to accept the Grace, Favour and Priviledges God has promiſed us, and to perform the Duties he has impoſed on us, together with our Gratitude and Senſe of his Favours; thus a City Honoured with a Charter may declare its Acceptance and Senſe of its Princes Favours, by putting that Charter in a rich Caſe, carrying it in Proceſſion when they receive it: likewiſe by Addreſſes, Bonefires, Ringing of Bells, Illuminations, and ſuch other actions as uſually repreſent the Grateful Affections and Reſolutions of our minds; and it is to be obſerved, that tho' theſe Signs Repreſenting the Duty and Gratitude of the Perſons thus Favoured, be not required in the Charter, nay tho' Oaths or other Declarations of their acceptance be particularly ſpecified in it, yet no Prince ever takes ill at their Subjects hands theſe voluntary Signs, repreſenting the Duty, Gratitude and Acceptance of his Favours. I do not find Mr. *B.* takes notice of this Senſe of Repreſenting Signs, but it is a Senſe very obvious, and muſt be allowed of by all.

4*thly*, Signs may be called *Obliging*, becauſe they oblige God by his Promiſe, to give us when we duly uſe them, the Grace, Benefit or Priviledges ſignified by them, and ſuch Signs as repreſent God's Will to confer Grace on us in the firſt Senſe of *Repreſenting* Signs, are *Obliging* Signs in this ſenſe; that is, they oblige God to give the Grace repreſented in them, ſo that *Obliging* and *Repreſenting* Signs in this ſenſe are in effect the ſame, and run into one another; and in this ſenſe Sacraments, as is owned both by Mr. *B.* and me, are peculiarly *Repreſenting* and *Obliging* Signs.

5*thly*, A Sign may be called *Obliging*, becauſe it declares God's Will to us by ſignifying that he requires certain Duties and Returns from us; which Declaration of God's Will by Words or Signs, obliges us to perform thoſe Duties; And Signs that repreſent in the ſe-

cond

cond ſenſe the Duties required by God, are Obliging from God to us in this ſenſe; for whatever Sign inſtructs us by repreſenting any thing to us as our Duty, doth likewiſe oblige us to perform it, ſo that Obliging Signs in this ſenſe are the ſame with Repreſenting, and need not be diſtinguiſhed.

6thly, A Sign may be called *Obliging*, becauſe it declares our Intention, Reſolution and Promiſe to perform what is required of us in our Covenant with God; and Signs that Repreſent, in the third ſenſe, our acceptance of God's Grace, and reſolution to perform our Duty, are alſo thus obliging, and are properly Signs from us to God; the ſame are likewiſe Ratifying and Dedicating on our part, which is owned by Mr. *B.* p. 45. where he tells us, That to *Oblige and Bind our ſelves to ſerve God*, is the ſame thing as to *Dedicate our ſelves to his Service*: and indeed a Sign can be no otherwiſe *Ratifying* or *Dedicating* on our part, then as it ſignifies and declares our Reſolution and Promiſe to perform the Duties we owe to God.

7thly, A Sign may be called *Diſtinguiſhing*, becauſe it ſignifies and conveys to us ſome Priviledge and Benefit which effectually Diſtinguiſheth us from the reſt of the World, and obliges others to own us as ſo priviledged. Thus the King's Patent to a Noble-Man, diſtinguiſheth him, and obliges others to take notice of him. And thus the regenerating Principle of Grace, conveyed to us in Baptiſm, makes an effectual diſtinction of Chriſtians from other men; and the Priviledges conveyed to us thereby, oblige all other Chriſtians to own us as fellow-Members and Heirs of the ſame Hope with themſelves. Hence Signs *Repreſenting* Graces conferred by God (in the firſt ſenſe) or *Obliging* on God's part (in the fourth ſenſe) are likewiſe peculiarly *Diſtinguiſhing* Badges and Signs of our Chriſtianity in this laſt ſenſe.

8thly, Laſtly, A Sign may be called *Diſtinguiſhing*, becauſe we thereby Teſtify, Profeſs and Declare to the World, that we Claim and Own the Priviledges and Characters that God has beſtowed on us: And thus every Chriſtian duty we perform, every Profeſſion we make of our Faith either by Words or Actions, are Diſtinguiſhing Badges & Signs of our Chriſtianity, peculiarly ſuch Signs as repreſent our Duty, or Gratitude in the third ſenſe, or obliges us to perform it, in the fifth ſenſe are thus likewiſe *Diſtinguiſhing*.

From all which it is manifeſt, Firſt, That Mr *B.* has expreſſed the Uſes and Ends of Sacraments in a very confuſed and uncertain manner;

ner; to *Repreſent*, *Oblige* and *Diſtinguiſh* being in effect the ſame, and running into one another; & yet each of them containing very different uſes under them that ought carefully to be Diſtinguiſhed; ſo that he has made a Diſtinction where there was no neceſſity for it, and omitted to diſtinguiſh where it was neceſſary.

2*dly*, You muſt obſerve that *Repreſenting* Signs in the firſt and ſecond ſenſe (that is, as they repreſent either Benefits conferred on us by God or Duties impoſed on us by him) *Obliging* Signs in the fourth and fifth ſenſe (that is, as they ſignify God's obliging himſelf by his Promiſe, or us by his Command) and Laſtly, *Diſtinguiſhing* Signs in the ſeventh ſenſe (as they ſignify Privileges beſtowed on us by God) are all of them Signs from God to us, not from us to God.

3*dly*, Only *Repreſenting* Signs in the third ſenſe *Obliging* in the ſixth, and *Diſtinguiſhing* Signs in the eighth (that is, as they repreſent our Reſolutions Promiſes and Profeſſions, and as they bind and diſtinguiſh us by them) are Signs from us to God; and it will appear on examination, that the Sign of the Croſs is only concerned in theſe laſt uſes, and that the Scriptures Warrant other Signs, that are not Sacraments, for them.

Sect. IV.
Of Repreſenting Signs.

AS to the Firſt Senſe of *Repreſenting* Signs, that is, as they ſignify to us God's conferring on us and conveying to us certain Graces or Priviledges repreſented to us in and by them. I deſire you to take notice that this is the firſt thing that I ſhewed in my *Admonition*, (*p.* 59) to be neceſſary to a Sacrament; that is, *An outward and viſible Sign*, inſtituted by God, *of ſome inward and ſpiritual Grace or Benefit which we expect from him.*

I ſhewed you likewiſe (*p.* 178) That the Croſs is not uſed by us to ſignify *any Grace or Benefit communicated to us from God:* And this is the univerſal Senſe of all that have undertaken the Defence of it in our Church; but Mr. *B* from ſome Conjectures of his own, undertakes to prove that we mean by it, that which we profeſs and declare not to mean. Thus *Vind. p.* 44. he *thinks there is juſt ground to conclude the contrary* from the words of the Thirtieth Canon of the Church of *England*, which acknowledges that the *Holy Ghoſt by the mouth of the Apoſtles did honour the name of the Croſs ſo far, that under it he comprehended*

prehended not only Chriſt Crucified, but the Force, Effect and Merit of his Death and Paſſion, with all Comforts, Fruits and Promiſes we receive or expect thereby. From whence he concludes, that with us the Croſs muſt be an *External Sign to ſignify the ſame things which the Holy Ghoſt had Honoured the name of the Croſs to ſignify.*

But I anſwer that none of the Expounders of our Canons, or Defenders of the Sign of the Croſs have thus interpreted this Canon; nay, on the contrary, they have given it a quite different ſenſe, as he himſelf owns in this very place where he Quotes the Author of the *Caſe relating to the Croſs in Baptiſm*, explaining the Canon in another Senſe. Now for Mr. *B.* to put a Senſe on the Words of our Canon, and make an Inference from them which none of us own, but Proteſt againſt, is to ſet up an Adverſary purpoſely that he may confute him; and ſuch Proceedings are looked on by all impartial Men as the effects of Prejudice and Engagement to a Party.

Nay, not only the Divines of our Church Proteſt againſt his Inference from this Canon, but the very Canon it ſelf makes a quite contrary Inference, concluding from *the Scriptures ſignifying by the name of the Croſs, Chriſt and his Benefits*; that the Primitive Chriſtians uſed the Sign of it, not to ſignify theſe Benefits as communicated to us by God, but to Teſtify thereby that they were not aſhamed of it, but *owned him for their God and Saviour, who ſuffered the Death of the Croſs for them*, and Signed their Children with it *when Chriſtened, to Dedicate them by that Badge to his Service whoſe Benefits beſtowed on them in Baptiſm, the Name of the Croſs did Repreſent.* The uſe then of the Croſs according to the Canon is not, as Mr. *B.* wou'd infer, to ſignify an Act of God towards us, to confer any Benefit on us, or require any Duty of us, but to ſignify and repreſent our own Act, whereby we Reſolve, Promiſe and Bind our ſelves not to be aſhamed of a Crucified Saviour, or his Benefits purchaſed by his Croſs, and ſignified to us under that Name in Scripture: And not only our Church but all other Chriſtians from the Apoſtles time, have for this reaſon looked on making the Sign of the Croſs, as a very fit Inſtance and Declaration of their Glorying in Chriſt's Sufferings, and Readineſs to follow him in them; which is an effectual Dedication of our ſelves to his Service, tho' we do not think it a fit External Sign to ſignify God's Communicating to us the Graces or Benefits of the New Covenant, becauſe that being an Act of God, ought only to be Repreſented and Conveyed to us by Signs particularly Inſtituted by him;

whereas our Glorying in his Sufferings, and Dedicating our ſelves to follow him in them, being Acts of ours, may lawfully be ſignified by ſuch Signs as Univerſal Cuſtom has made proper; as will appear more at large in this Diſcourſe: What I have ſaid being ſufficient to ſhew that the Croſs is no *Repreſenting* Sign in this Senſe.

II. *2dly*, As to the Second ſort of *Repreſenting* Signs, which ſignify and diſcover to us God's Pleaſure and Command concerning ſome Duties ſet forth and repreſented by them, which Duties God wou'd have us perform. Let me obſerve that the Croſs is no more a *Repreſenting* Sign with us in this Senſe then in the former, ſince we do not uſe it to ſignify or declare God's Will to us, that we ſhou'd perform any Duty, but only our own Reſolution, and Purpoſe to perform thoſe Duties, that God himſelf has ſignified under the Name of the Croſs in Scripture, and that we ſhall not be aſhamed to confeſs Him, that was Crucified on it: This is manifeſt from the very words of our Office, in which the Sign of the Croſs is uſed only as *a Token that hereafter* the Baptiſed perſon *ſhall not be aſhamed to confeſs the Faith of Chriſt Crucified, and manfully to fight under his Banner againſt Sin, the World and the Devil, and to continue Chriſt's Faithful Soldier and Servant unto his lives end.* This is the only uſe our Church makes of the Sign of the Croſs; and you ſee plainly that it is here made only a Token of of our owning a Crucified Saviour, and an Inſtance that we are not aſhamed of his Croſs and Sufferings: And indeed it is as plain an Inſtance of our not being thus aſhamed, and of our reſolution to follow him, in taking up our Croſs and engaging in his Warfare and Service, as giving an Alms is an Inſtance of Charity. But here is nothing of God's declaring or ſignifying his Will to us by this Sign, that we ſhou'd perform theſe Duties, or any intimation that we uſe it to this purpoſe.

And yet if we did uſe it, it wou'd not give it any thing of a Sacramental nature, much leſs make it a *Human Sacrament* for it is no Peculiar, much leſs Principal uſe of Sacraments to Repreſent God's Pleaſure to us, that we ſhou'd perform certain Duties, ſince we find many Signs uſed in Scripture to this purpoſe that are no Sacraments. I ſhall content my ſelf with two Inſtances, amongſt many. The Firſt is that of the Sabbath Day, *Ezek.* 20. 12. *Moreover I gave them my Sabbaths to be a Sign between me and them, that they might know me, that I am the Lord that ſanctifies them.* Here the Sabbath Day is deſcribed as a *Covenanting Sign* between God and his People, *repre-*

ſenting

ſenting to them, and *Inſtructing* them from God in their Duty to know the Lord that Sanctified them. We have another Example, *Exod.* 19. 10. *Go unto the people, and ſanctify them to day, and to morrow, and let them waſh their cloaths.* This Waſhing their Cloaths was certainly a Rite or Sign *Repreſenting* to them from the Lord, the inward Purity required of them, and inſtructing them that it was God's Will that they ſhould approach him with Holineſs, and yet I ſuppoſe neither this nor the former were properly Sacraments; and indeed Mr. *P.* owns, *p.* 39. That all *barely Inſtructive Signs* are not *Sacramental or Federal ones.* I add that from theſe Inſtances it appears, that all Inſtructive Signs, tho' *Federal* or *Covenanting* are not Sacramental, and therefore Mr. *B.* had no reaſon to Tax me as he doth in the ſame place, for *Omitting this Uſe in my Account of Sacraments*, ſince my deſign was only to mention thoſe Uſes that are peculiar to Sacraments; and it is manifeſt by his own Confeſſion that this is not ſo peculiar to them.

III. 3*dly*, The ſame muſt be ſaid concerning Signs that Repreſent and Signify our Deſire, Purpoſe and Reſolution, to accept the Grace, Favour and Priviledges God has Promiſed us, and to perform the Duties he has Impoſed on us, together with our Gratitude and Senſe of his Favours. To Repreſent in this Senſe is not peculiar to Sacraments, much leſs a Principal Uſe of them; nor has Mr. *B* produced one place of Scripture to prove this to be ſuch a Peculiar Uſe. On the contrary we have many Examples in Scripture, where other Signs are recommended to us for this purpoſe: Thus we find the *Reubinites* and *Gadites* and half Tribe of *Manaſſes* building an Altar, *Joſh.* 22. 10. without any particular Command from God, as ſufficiently appears from the whole Affair. The deſign of this Altar was not for Sacrifices; but *v.* 22. that it might be (ſay they) *a Witneſs between us, and you, and our Generations after us, that we may do the Service of the Lord before him, with our Burnt-Offerings, and with our Sacrifices, and with our Peace-Offerings, that your Children may not ſay to our Children in time to come, ye have no part in the Lord.* Here we have an Altar ſet up as a Sign, Teſtimony and Memorial, *Repreſenting* and Teſtifying that theſe People did Deſire, Reſolve and Purpoſe to Serve God according to his Commands, and that they claimed a Share and Intereſt in his Favours and Service: Yet this Declarative Sign of their Stedfaſt Intentions to Serve God and perform the Duties he required of them, was not Sacramental; tho' it was not for Burnt-Offerings,

yet

yet it was the *Pattern of the Altar of the Lord*, *v.* 28. and Repreſented their Claim to that Altar, together with their Reſolution to perform their Duty at it; and ſurely this is more like a Sacrament than uſing the Sign of the Croſs to teſtify, that we claim an Intereſt in it, and are not aſhamed of it: For the Croſs was the Altar on which our Sacrifice was offered, and we may as lawfully make the Pattern of it to teſtify and claim our Right in the Sacrifice that was offered on it, as the *Reubinits* made the pattern of the Altar of the Lord to teſtify and claim their right to the Sacrifices offered on it. Every Impartial Conſiderer will ſee that the Caſe is Exactly Parallel as to this point.

I might Inſtance in many other ſuch Signs in the Old Teſtament if it were neceſſary; but I ſhall add one or two out of the New. Firſt it was a Duty required of all Men to acknowledge and Recognize our Saviour as the Meſſias and King of *Iſrael*. If we look into the 21*ſt*. Chapter of St. *Matthew*, we may obſerve that the Multitude did acknowledge him as ſuch, and expreſſed their acceptance of him, their Reſolution to ſubmit to him, and thankfullneſs for his favours, by ſuch Signs as were uſual on ſuch Occaſions. It was the Cuſtom to receive great Kings and Princes with ſolemn Acclamations, to ſtrew the way when they Entered into any place with Branches and Garments: Therefore the Multitude did thus own our Saviour to be the Meſſias and King of *Iſrael*, and their deſire to ſubmit to him. And that not only by Acclamations and joyning their Voices in their Praiſes and Thankſgivings, but likewiſe (in the eight Verſe) *They ſpread their Garments in the way, and others cut down Branches from the Trees, and ſtrewed them in the way*; which tho' not required by our Saviour, that we can find, were accepted, as well as their Hoſanna's; yet theſe *Repreſenting* Signs, tho' direct Acknowledgments and Declarations of their Accepting our Saviour as their King, and of their Submitting to him, had nothing of Sacraments in them: And therefore the Sign of the Croſs tho' it Repreſent to the World that we own a Crucified Chriſt, and that we reſolve not to be aſhamed of him, has nothing in it of a Sacramental nature, any more than the Branches and Garments ſtrewed in his way.

A Second Inſtance in the New Teſtament ſhall be the *Kiſs of Charity*. I ſhewed you in my *Admonition*, p. 74. that 'tis a Special Duty to lay aſide all Hatred, and to be in Charity with one another when we come to the Lord's-Supper; and that this Duty was ſignified by a

Holy

Holy Kiſs, whereby the Communicants Repreſented their Deſire, Purpoſe and Reſolution to perform this Duty; this is home to the Point, and exactly parallel to the Croſs in Baptiſm, and if the one be a Sacrament, the other is likewiſe. The ſame may be ſaid of the Feaſt of Charity.

Mr. *B.* Anſwered three things to this, *Vind. p.* 52. Firſt, That he doth not ſee that this was a *Religious Rite at all*: But this is directly contrary to Scripture; the word *Religious* is never applied to Rites or Places in it, but that which we call Religious is there called *Holy*, and the Scripture gives this Title to the Kiſs, here mentioned in three places, calling it a *Holy Kiß*, to diſtinguiſh it as well from the Civil as Prophane, *Rom.* 16. 16. 1 *Cor.* 19. 20. 2 *Cor.* 13. 12. and in the fourth place where it is uſed, 1 *Pet.* 5. 14. it is called a *Kiſs of Charity*. I ſuppoſe the Difference between Civil and Religious Signs conſiſts in this; that one ſort of theſe ſignifies Civil matters, and the other Religious: Now this Sign was uſed in the Chriſtian Aſſemblies to Signify, Declare and Teſtify the Grace of *Charity*, which is the Sum and Perfection of our Religion, there are not clearer Proofs that Baptiſm is a Religious Sign than theſe; and you may judge with your ſelves what it is that hinders Mr. *B.* from ſeeing it.

But 2*dly*, He objects, (*Vind. p.* 52.) that this was a *Real expreſſion of their mutual Charity*; This I own to be true, and do believe that every Sign made ſignificant by general Cuſtom, when uſed as it ſhould be, is a real Expreſſion and Inſtance of the thing it ſignifies, ſo making the Sign of the Croſs is a real Expreſſion and Inſtance of our Glorying in Chriſt, as much as Kiſſing one another is of our mutual Charity; the ſame thing that made the one ſo, made likewiſe the other, that is univerſal Cuſtom.

3*dly*, He objects that it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe that it had a temporary Inſtitution, I own it is not only reaſonable to ſuppoſe this, but certain that it had, ſince it is Four times Commanded in Scripture; but this is ſo far from preventing the *Holy Kiſs* from being a Sacrament, that it ſhou'd the rather be one becauſe it had this Inſtitution; This I look on as a demonſtration that a Sign that meerly Repreſents our Deſire, Reſolution and Purpoſe, to perform a certain Duty, tho' Commanded in Scripture, hath nothing of a Sacramental nature in it; and therefore the Croſs is not a Sacrament, nor has it any thing of a Sacramental uſe by Repreſenting our Duty to confeſs Chriſt Crucified.

Let me further obſerve, that the Church of God has laid aſide this *Teaching* and *Repreſenting Sign*, tho' Inſtituted in Scripture, and Practiſed for many Years; and therefore muſt be ſuppoſed to have Autho

rity to Inſtitute others of the like nature in the Celebration of the Sacraments, ſince the ſame Authority is neceſſary to Abrogate as to Inſtitute any *Religious Action or Repreſenting Sign.*

And this is no more in effect, then I find owned by ſome of the moſt Eminent Men of your Party; ſo Mr. *Bowles*, in his *Paſtor Evangelius*, *Lib.* 3. *Cap.* 1. *Poteſt Eccleſia ſive Signa ſive Media ſtatuere*, &c. *The Church has Power to appoint both Signs and Means, by which Men may Teſtify their Pious Affections before others, whilſt they Celebrate Divine Worſhip. Provided theſe Signs be ſuch as the inſtinct of Nature doth ſuggeſt, or be taken from what is Cuſtomary in Life according to the difference of Nations, and have nothing of Scandal in them, for theſe Signs are only declarative, which, ſo far as I know are granted to be Lawful by all.* Amongſt theſe he reckons Rendring the Garments, Covering the Head with Aſhes, Powering out Waters, 1 *Sam.* 7. 5. for a token of Repentance, Writing and Sealing the Covenant when renewed, the Feaſts of Charity, the Holy Kiſs and Vailing Women; and he might as well have reckoned the Sign of the Croſs as a Token of our not being Aſhamed of Chriſt Crucified, for this is a Declarative Sign of our pious Affections, as well as any of the other; it is Warranted by general Cuſtom, as well as they are, and it is only Declarative for we aſcribe no Virtue or Efficacy to it, but declare againſt its having any ſuch Virtue in expreſs terms, in the Thirtieth Canon, which injoyns it.

And whereas Mr. *B.* alledges that we uſe it to *Bind* and *Dedicate* our ſelves to God's Service, and as a *Diſtinguiſhing Badge of our Chriſtian* Profeſſion, *p.* 48. I doubt not but it will appear in the next Sections, that every one of thoſe Declarative Signs mentioned by Mr. *Bowles*, do *Bind* and *Dedicate* to God's Service thoſe that uſe them, as much as the Sign of the Croſs, and are purpoſely deſigned to *Diſtinguiſh* the pious and devout Worſhipers of God, as well as to expreſs their devout Affections before men, and that therefore Mr. *B*'s. inſiſting on the Croſſes, being a *Dedicating Sign*, or a *Diſtinguiſhing Badge*, to prove it a Sacrament, is no more then a Playing with Words, and Amuſing the Reader, by endeavouring to fix that Doctrine on us under Equivocal Terms which we utterly deny: And the only Queſtion here will be, whether we or Mr. *B.* know our Doctrine beſt; if our Church, if our Divines may be believed, the Croſs is only a Declarative Sign of our Pious Affections, not to be Aſhamed of Chriſt Crucified, &c. But if you believe Mr. *B.* it is ſomthing more that makes it a Sacrament: But this belongs more properly to the next Section of *Obliging Signs*, and I ſhall proceed to conſider thoſe.

Sect.

SECT. V.

Concerning Obliging Signs.

I. BUT Fourthly, A Sign may be called *obliging*; becauſe it obliges God by his Promiſe to give us the Spiritual Grace, or Benefit ſignified by it, when we duly uſe it; this was the ſecond thing I obſerved neceſſary to make up a Sacrament. I told you in my *Admonition*, *p.* 65. That this is the very thing that conſtitutes a Sign to be a Sacrament, and diſtinguiſhes it from all other Signs; and this being wanting, tho' a Sign had all other things like a Sacrament, yet it wou'd no more be a Sacrament, than an Image that in every thing reſembled a Man but wanted a Soul, wou'd be a Man; Mr. *B.* owns that this is neceſſary to a Sacrament, and doth not pretend that we aſcribe this uſe to the Sign of the Croſs; and therefore I may diſmiſs this Point as agreed;

However, I think it neceſſary here to obſerve, That when God has given a Man power to confer any Favour or Benefit on another, tho' he has not appointed any Sign by which that Perſon is to confer it; yet the Scripture warrants him to uſe ſuch Signs as are proper in the conveying it; thus our Saviour, *Mark* 3. 15. gave his Diſciples power to heal Sickneſs, but did not, that appears, order them to uſe any Sign in the performance of it; yet *Mark* 6. 13. We find they uſed Oyl, a ſymbol of Joy and Health: *They Anointed with Oyl many that were Sick and Healed them*: They uſed alſo the Signs of ſending *Handkerchiefs* and *Aprons* to the ſame purpoſe; ſo likewiſe our Saviour gave his Diſciples power to beſtow the Holy Ghoſt, but ordered no Sign; yet we find the Apoſtles uſed the common Sign of Bleſſing; ſo *Act.* 8. 17. Then *laid they their Hands on them and they Received the Holy Ghoſt.* Laſtly, Our Saviour gave his Apoſtles power to ordain Governours in the Church, but appointed no Sign for it; yet they uſed the common Sign imployed in theſe Caſes, *Acts* 13. 3. *When they had Faſted and Prayed they laid their Hands on them, and ſent them away*; there are ſeveral other ſuch Signs in Scripture

pture, which are not Sacraments: Becauſe, tho' a ſpiritual Benefit or Gift be conferred with the uſe of them, yet it is not by vertue of any Promiſe annext to the uſe of the Signs themſelves, as it is in Baptiſm and the Lords Supper, but by vertue of the general command to thoſe Authoriſed Perſons to conſer thoſe Benefits or Graces, in the conferring of which, theſe Signs are no means or conditions, nor have they any other part beſides that of being Solemnities of the Action, and ſignifying the perſons intention, to exerciſe the Power that God has given him, at the time when he uſes them; and this is carefully to be obſerved, otherwiſe we ſhall eaſily be miſtaken in the Nature of Sacraments, and imagine things to be ſo that really are not.

II. Fifthly, A Sign may be called *Obliging*, becauſe it is a Declaration from God of his Will, That he requires certain Duties and Returns from us, which are ſignified and repreſented to us in the Sign, which Declaration obliges us to perform thoſe Duties and make thoſe Returns.

I have ſhewed already in the ſecond Particular, That *only God can appoint theſe Signs*, and that ſuch declarative Signs of Gods Will, where they have no Promiſe annexed of ſome Spiritual Grace or Benefit, are not Sacraments, tho' they are Obligations on us from God. I muſt add, That the Sign of the Croſs is not uſed by our Church to any ſuch purpoſe, , as appears ſufficiently from what I have ſaid before on the ſecond particular uſe of Signs as *Repreſentative*.

III. Sixthly, a Sign may be called *Obliging*, becauſe it declares our Intention, Reſolution, and Promiſe to perform the Duties God requires of us in our Covenant with him; a Sign that is thus Obliging, is likewiſe a *Ratifying* and *Dedicating* Sign on our part, and is owned to be the ſame by Mr. *B's Vind. p.* 45. For we cannot be ſaid to ratifie our Covenant with God, or Dedicate our ſelves to him by a Sign, for any other Reaſon, but becauſe it declares and ſignifies our Reſolution and Promiſe to perform our covenant with him.

We do own, That the Sign of the Croſs is an *Obliging*, *Ratifying*, and *Dedicating* Sign in this ſenſe; that is, it declares and ſignifies our Reſolution and Promiſe to perform all the Duties God requires of us in our Covenant, not to be aſhamed of Chriſt Crucified, but manfully to fight under his Banner againſt Sin, the Devil, and the World. The great ſtreſs of Mr. *B's* Argument to prove the Croſs an humane Sacrament ſeems to conſiſt in this, as appears from what he ſays, *p.* 45. where

where the whole force of his Argument againſt the Croſs, depends on our making it a Rite, whereby *we Oblige and Bind our ſelves to ſerve God*; But in order to clear the matter, I will ſhew, that an *Obliging*, *Ratifying*, *Dedicating* Sign in this ſenſe, has nothing of a Sacramental Nature in it; but that we may make uſe of ſuch Signs to this purpoſe as common Univerſal Cuſtom has made proper, This I will ſhew, Firſt, from *Scripture*,, and Secondly, from your *own Practice*, and then ſhall make appear, that the uſe of the Sign of the Croſs is altogether of this ſort.

IV. 1. For the proof of this from Scripture I appeal to the Jewiſh Church after the Captivity. The Jews had been guilty of many breaches of Gods Covenant made with their Fathers; and there was great neceſſity to renew it on their part, and accordingly we find they applyed themſelves to do it, *with faſting, with Sack cloaths, and earth upon them. Neh.* 9. 1. and after a ſolemn humiliation and confeſſion they renew their Covenant with God, and declare their reſolution and promiſe to keep it, by ſuch methods as were uſual to oblige men in other caſes, that is firſt by an Oath *Neh.* chap. 10. 29. *they entred into a Curſe and into an Oath to walk in Gods law, which was given by Moſes.*

2. They *Bind*, *Engage*, and *Oblige* themſelves by certain uſual Signs; never, that we can find preſcribed by God, that is by *writing and ſealing* the Covenant *Neh.* 9. 3. 8. *we make a ſure Covenant, and write it, and our Princes, Levites, and Prieſts Seal unto it*, Now to make a Covenant with God, the ſame that circumciſion entered them into, even to *walk in Gods law which was given by Moſes*, was certainly to *oblige*, *engage*, and *dedicate* themſelves to Gods ſervice. Mr. *B.* himſelf alleges vind. p. 42. that *Circumciſion was an external bond on thoſe that received it to obſerve that law*; yet notwithſtanding this Bond of Circumciſion, and their renewing the ſame obligation in the paſſeover, Theſe Jews added new Bonds to their Covenant and made uſe of new Signs to engage and oblige themſelves to keep it, and to ratifie and confirm it on their part.

It cannot be denyed but *Signing* and *Sealing* are outward Signs, and their uſe is to ratifie and confirm that to which the Name and Seal is put, and to oblige the Perſons to perform what they promiſe in it; if therefore theſe be peculiar and principal uſes of Sacraments, it clearly follows that theſe Jews by uſing theſe Signs made two Sacraments (for ought appears out of their own head) but if God commanded them, then here are two Signs *obliging, confirming, and ratifying the Covenant*

they

they entred into, of divine Inſtitution, and then they muſt be divine Sacraments, which no body ever yet pretended that I have heard of; the truth then is, that to renew our Covenant with God, to declare our reſolution, purpoſe and promiſe to obey Gods laws, and keep his Covenant either by ſuch words or Signs, as univerſal cuſtom has made expreſſive of ſuch a promiſe *&c.* are alike lawful, and the one has no more of a Sacramental nature in it than the other.

V. I ſhall add one inſtance more, out of the new Teſtament, and that is *laying on of hands*; a Sign uſed in Bleſſing from the Patriarchs to this day; Fathers uſed it in bleſſing their Children, Prieſts in bleſſing not only the People but likewiſe in bleſſing Perſons and Offerings dedicated to God, but more particularly it is uſed in that ſolemn bleſſing to which our Church directs us in our Catechiſm under the Title of being *Confirmed by the Bp.* For the underſtanding of which you muſt obſerve,

Firſt that the Apoſtles, who had commiſſion to teach and Baptize, did upon their Converts declaring their conviction of our Saviours being the *Meſſias* or *Chriſt*, immediately Baptize them, tho they were not particularly inſtructed in all the parts and dutys of the religion they embraced, as appears ſufficiently from the ſecond of the *Acts*, where in one day 3000 were Converted and the ſame day Baptized: as appears *v.* 41. *Then they that gladly received his words were Baptized, and the ſame day there were added to them about* 3000 *Souls.* it is not to be ſuppoſed that all theſe cou'd be fully inſtructed in all the neceſſary Articles of their Faith, but it was ſufficient that in general they believed in *Chriſt* and were willing to learn his Doctrine as opportunity offered; the ſame appears in Baptizing the Jailour and his Family, *Acts* 16. and on ſeveral other occaſions. This is one ground of Baptizing the Children of the Faithfull with us, becauſe it is ſuppoſed that God according to his promiſe will in Baptiſm give a principle of Faith to ſuch; which, together with the influence of their parents on them, and of the ſociety whereof they are members, will diſpoſe them to learn the principles of their Religion, as ſoon as they are capable; So that there is a radical Faith, and preſumed willingneſs tho not an actual.

2. At the beginning of Chriſtianity the Converts were many and the Teachers few; and it wou'd have too much confined them if they had been obliged to teach every Convert in the ordinary methods of Learning; and therefore God gave the Apoſtles an extraordinary power to confer the Holy Ghoſt which they did by laying on of hands;

This

This gift of the Holy Ghoſt not only lead thoſe that received it into all truth, but likewiſe enabled them to teach others; which appears from ſeveral places of Scripture, particularly from *Acts* 8. & 19. 6. *when Paul had laid his hands on them the Holy Ghoſt came upon them, and they ſpake with Tongues and Propheſied.*

3. When the number of Teachers were ſufficiently multiplyed, this extraordinary manner of teaching Converts, and enabling them to teach others was not neceſſary; not but the Holy Ghoſt is ſtill the true Teacher of his Church, in ſomuch, as without his influence, no Man can attain ſuch a degree of Knowledge as to ſave his own Soul, or inſtruct others; all true Knowledge then is ſtill from him, but it is not without our own induſtry, or ſtudy, or the aſſiſtance of thoſe that Chriſt has commiſſioned to Teach us in an ordinary way.

4. Such as were Baptized immediately after their Converſion before full inſtruction, or in their infancy, when particularly and explicitly inſtructed, were brought before the Church, and there made a ſolemn Recognition of their Faith, and declared their Reſolution to adhere to it; whereupon the Biſhop, or chief Governour of the Church laid his hands on them, Bleſſed them, Prayed for their continuance in Grace and Knowledge, and admitted them as competently inſtructed Members; by this they were taught and aſſured, that the Grace and Knowledge they had, was from the Holy Spirit; and that the encreaſe and continuance of it muſt be Expected from him.

5. This laying on of hands is reckoned a principle of our Religion, *Hebr.* 6. 2. and joyned with Baptiſm.

That this is the true meaning of the Place, will appear, not only from the Practice of the Church of God, that has continued the uſe of this Sign from the Apoſtles time to this day, but likewiſe from the beſt Interpreters of all ſorts and Ages; amongſt the Ancients, St. *Chryſoſtome*, St. *Auguſtine*, and *Theophylact*, thus interpret it; amongſt the Romaniſts, The ordinary *Gloſs*, *Lyra*, and many others; amongſt the Reformers, *Calvin*, *Beza*, and *Diodati*; and the Aſſemblies Notes, which I hope will weigh ſomewhat with you; Amongſt the Socinians *Crellius*; ſo that, one wou'd think that all Parties were agreed in it.

Mr. *B.* indeed gives me very hard words for reckoning this a principle of Chriſtianity, tho' I have the expreſs Letter of Scripture for doing ſo; and in his Remarke p. 88. interprets *Baptiſms, and laying on of Hands* of the Jewiſh Waſhings and Sacrifices, directly

contrary to the Apoſtles Profeſſion, who in the firſt verſe declares, that he intends to leave theſe Principles here named, and to paſs on to perfection; whereas he is ſo far from leaving theſe Jewiſh Waſhings and Sacrifices, that he paſſes on to them, and ſpends a good part of his Diſcourſe on them, as may be ſeen in the 9. and 10. chapters; and indeed the applying Jewiſh Types to the paſſages in the New Teſtament which they prefigured, was a Doctrine not for Beginners, but as in Chap. 5. 14. for thoſe *that by reaſon of uſe have their ſenſes exerciſed to diſcern both Good and Evil*: when the Lords Supper was thought too great a Miſtery to teach ſuch Beginners, and therefore is not mentioned amongſt theſe Elements, no wonder if the Types of the Law which were much more obſcure were thought improper.

But to proceed, we have here laying on of hands reckoned a *Principle* of Chriſtianity, and judged by all parties a proper Sign to be uſed, when Perſons Baptiſed in their infancy or before full inſtruction, come to Ratify and Confirm with their *own Mouths* their Baptiſmal Covenant, and to promiſe a *faithful obſervance* of it to the end; in which ſenſe it is plainly an obliging Sign on our part, as much as a Seal is to a Bond, and hence it has been called a Seal from the very Apoſtles atime, as may be ſeen in *Clemens Alex.* that lived near them, and many others of the Ancients, yet it is no Sacrament; neither hath it any more of a Sacramental nature in it, then laying on hands in Ordination.

Beſides, This Ratification and Obligation on our part it is uſed by our Church to Certify thoſe that ratifie and renew their Covenant, of Gods *favour and gracious goodneſs* to them, yet this doth not make it a Sacrament, ſince the Miniſters of God by vertue of the Keys, have Power to certifie all ſuch as in earneſt conſent to Gods Covenant at all times, of Gods favour and gracious acceptance of them, and *may* eſpecially on ſuch ſolemn occaſions as this of their publick Recognition of their Baptiſmal Covenant, or on their publick Reconciliation after Penance, certifie them of it by proper Signs, (ſuppoſe by a kiſs as well) as by words, and ſuch Signs ſignifie only their intention at that time, to exert the general Power God has given them, as I ſhewed before in Anointing the Sick, laying on hands for the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, and for Ordination; which have nothing of a Sacramental nature in them, becauſe no Promiſe obliging God is annexed to them.

IV. Having thus ſhewed from Scripture, that we may make uſe of ſuch Signs to oblige our ſelves to Ratifie and Confirm our Covenant with God, as general Cuſtom has made proper; I come in the ſecond place, to ſhew the ſame from your own practice. And this I ſhall make appear from two Inſtances; The firſt, is that of the *ſolemn League and Covenant*, The precedent which your Party took for this, was the Jews renewing their Covenant with God, *Neh.* 10. And the General Aſſembly of *Scotland* in their acknowledgement of publick Sins, call it *the Oath and Covenant which* they *made with God*, and the *Covenant and Cauſe of God*; and indeed it obliged them to all the *Duties we owe to God and Man*; which is as large as our Baptiſmal Covenant. Into this Covenant with God they entred, not only by words but Signs alſo, and bound themſelves to the performance of it; firſt by *Subſcribing* it which is one Sign, as in the Act of the general aſſembly; *Act* 6 1648. ſecondly by *ſtanding up at it*; thirdly by *lifting up their Hands*; ſo the Houſe of Commons took it, *Sep.* 22. 1693. and by *ſwearing thereunto did worſhip the great Name of God and Teſtify ſo much outwardly by lifting up their hands, and ſubſcribed their Names to it.* Laſtly, the Parliament ordered, *Feb.* 2. 1693. that the whole Kingdome ſhould take it *ſtanding*, their *right hand bare, and liſt up*; all theſe were plainly *federal Rites*, and did declare and ſignifie the Intention, Purpoſe, and Vow of the takers to perform this Covenant with God, and conſequently were *Obliging*, *Ratifying*, *and Confirming* Signs on their part, and I doubt not but many thought they did therein *Dedicate* themſelves anew to Gods ſervice; for as I have already ſhewed a *Sign*, that ſignifies our vow and promiſe to ſerve God is a dedicating Sign; if therefore the Sign of the Croſs be a *Sacrament*, becauſe it is a Token that we ſhall not be aſhamed to Confeſs Chriſt Crucified, and that we reſolve to ſerve him to our Lives end, then all theſe were plainly Sacraments, for they were Tokens of the ſame thing thing in the Eſtimation of thoſe that uſed them.

I ſhall add one inſtance more, and that is, giving perſons names in Baptiſm; this as I obſerved in my admonition, p. 7. 2, ſignifies *our giving up our Names to Chriſt and engaging to be his Servants*; and therefore theſe Names are a laſting badge and token to us through our whole lives, of our dedication to Chriſts ſervice, and and an obligation on us to behave our ſelves accordingly.

To this Mr. *B.* replies two things; Firſt, *vind.* p. 53. that all this is *ſuggeſted by my own fancy without any ground, for you have*

other uſe of this Practice in Baptiſm, than that the Perſons Baptized may be notifyed to the Congregation.

To this I anſwer; *Firſt*, that it doth not come home to the Point, ſince it doth not determine whether it be Lawful to uſe this Sign of giving a Name to the purpoſes I have mentioned; if it be lawful ſo to uſe it, no matter whether you uſe it ſo or no; for it is ſtill an unanſwerable argument that an obliging Sign as ſuch has nothing of a Sacrament in it.

2. It is plain the Scriptures direct us to this uſe of giving Names, as well as the General cuſtom of the world; for we plainly find names given to ſignifie that thoſe who receive them, were either admitted as Servants, Sons, or Priviledged Perſons; and in all theſe Caſes their Names were obligatory Badges. To this purpoſe a name was conſtantly given by the Jewiſh Church at Circumciſion, and by the Chriſtian at Baptiſm; and that Name in the Primitive Church was entred in the Diptycks or Church Roll; they were called by it to receive the Holy Communion, and when cut off from the Church, their Names were blotted out of theſe Sacred Tables or Rolls; and therefore their Names given them in Baptiſm were effectual obligations and badges of their profeſſion.

3. I do not find any Authentick declaration of your Party againſt this uſe of Names, nor any Authority Mr. *B.* has to declare your ſenſe in the matter: Your Directory orders a Name to be given at Baptiſm; which ſhews the Authors thought it material, and not meerly a civil thing, for the deſign of the Directory is to order the worſhip of God, and there was no reaſon for them to appoint a civil Ceremony in ſo material a part of Gods worſhip as Baptiſm is; Mr, *B.* ſays, that it is, that the Perſon may be *notifyed to the Congregation*; that is, that they may diſtinguiſh him to be the Perſon that was Baptiſed: Now that which diſtinguiſhes and makes it known through his whole Life, that he is a member of Chriſt, is ſurely a badge of his profeſſion, and obliges him to do nothing unworthy of it. You call the Name you receive at Baptiſm your *Chriſtian* Name; and as your Sir Names ſhew your Family, ſo your Chriſtian Names ſhew your Profeſſion. I may add to this, that ſome of your party have been very nice in giving Names, and have called their Children by ſuch Names as they thought wou'd moſt likely put them in mind of their Duty to God, and oblige them to perform it, *thus ſome called* their Children, *Grace, Charity, Prudence, Faithfull, Praiſe God*; to what purpoſe but

to

to be a badge, token, memorial, and obligation to them to practise these Graces? Lastly the notes of the assembly on *Gen*: 17. 5. Observe on Gods giving *Abraham* a Name, that *some take the giving of a new Name, to note a Sacramental Renovation in the new sence of Circumcision, which now was first added to the Covenant, and thence hath it been the Practice of such as profess religion, to give Names to their Children at their Circumcision*, upon which they pass no censure. And Mr. *Ainsworth* (for whom I suppose you likewise have a value) has this Observation on it, *Abraham is the first Man in the World whose Name is changed of God: And it signified a change of Estate, and a renewing with increase of Grace from God; therefore this is after mentioned, as one of his favours*; Neh. 9 7. So Jacob's *name is made new* Gen. 32. 28. *and all true Christians*, Esay. 62. 2. Rev. 2. 17. So that what I said concerning giving of a Name to your Children, and particularly Gods giving one to *Abraham*, is not suggested by my *own fancy*, as Mr. *B.* alledgeth; I wish he wou'd adhere to the literal sence of Scripture and the best Commentators, as I am assured *I* endeavour to do.

But secondly he objects, that if this were true, then *this is a Scriptural Warrant for giving Names to Children at Baptism, as a token of their admission into Gods Family*; Vind. p. 53. and then it is a *Ceremony of Gods own appointment*; to which *I* answer, that this is a full proof that a Sign appointed by God to signifie our admission into his Family, of giving up our names to him, and engaging to be his servants is no Sacrament; and then it follows that it is so farr from being a principal use of a Sacrament to be a *binding* Sign only, that on the contrary it is no proper or peculiar use of it at all; but common to other Signs; and then our using the Sign of the Cross for an *obliging Sign on our parts* is not to ascribe any thing of a Sacramental nature to it.

From the whole I suppose it fully appears both from Scripture and your own practice that we may use some other Signs besides the Sacraments to *Oblige, Ratify*, and *Confirm* our Covenant with God, and bind our selves to his service and that our doing so doth not make those Signs *Humane Sacraments*.

And I desire you to remember that the whole design of our using the Sign of the Cross is, onely to declare and testify to the World that we look on our selves as persons thus *Bound, obliged and dedicated* to

Gods ſervice and that we are reſolved not to decline that Service or be aſhamed of it, for any danger or infamy that may attend it; tho' it ſhould expoſe us, as it did our Saviour, to the painful and ſhameful death of the Croſs.

To *Bind, oblige* and *Dedicate* our ſelves to Gods ſervice are properly acts of our minds: all that outward Signs can do, is to declare and expreſs theſe inward Acts; and ſurely there cannot be any outward Action that more properly or naturally doth declare our reſolution and purpoſe to dedicate our ſelves to the ſervice of a crucifyed Saviour then making the Sign of the Croſs: if then it be lawful as I have proved both from Scripture and your own practice to expreſs and declare theſe Acts of our minds by other Signs then the Sacraments, our uſeing the Sign of the Croſs to this purpoſe can never make it a new *Sacrament* or unlawful.

SECT. VI.

Concerning Diſtinguiſhing Signs.

I. I Shall now proceed to the third ſort of Signs, which Mr. *B.* mentions, which he calls *diſtinguiſhing*, I have ſhewed you, That theſe may be of two Sorts, and come under the Seventh and Eighth Conſiderations of Signs, as I have laid them down, *Sect.* 3. of this Appendix.

The 7th is, That a Sign may be called *Diſtinguiſhing*, becauſe it ſignifies and conveys to us ſome priviledge or benefit which effectually diſtinguiſheth us from the reſt of the World, and obliges others to own us as ſo priviledged; thus the Kings Patent to a Noble Man, diſtinguiſheth him, and obliges others to take notice of him; and thus the Regenerating Principle of Grace, conveyed to us in Baptiſm, makes an Effectual diſtinction of Chriſtians from other men; and the priviledges conveyed to us thereby oblige all other Chriſtians to own us as fellow members and Heirs of the ſame hope with themſelves, and thus the Lords Supper doth likewiſe diſtinguiſh us, by communicating to us the

the Body and Blood of our Saviour, by which our union with Chriſt is preſerved and increaſed, and the grace and priviledges received in baptiſm are renewed ſtrengthned and Confirmed to us.

I grant therefore that the *Sacraments* are diſtinguiſhing *Signs* in this ſenſe, and this uſe of them is plainly contained under the firſt Thing, that I ſhewed to be neceſſary to make them up, that is *an outward and viſible Sign Inſtituted by God, ſignifying ſome ſpiritual Grace or Benefit, which we expect from Him.* Such an *Inward* and Spiritual Grace or Benefit granted to us in the Sacraments doth indeed Diſtinguiſh us from all others, and entitle us to the Priviledges of Children: and the *Sacraments* are Conveyances and Badges of that Grace or Privilege as much as the Kings Patent is of Nobility, or laying on his *Sword* is of Knight hood. To make a *Diſtinguiſhing* Sign in this ſenſe were indeed to make a *Sacrament*, and we readily own that God only can appoint Signs to make one Man thus differ from another, or beſtow ſuch Badges on them.; but our Church has fully Declared that the ſign of the Croſs is not any ſuch Badge; and therefore Mr. B. is very unjuſt to us, when he affirms (Vind. p. 45) that *being Croſs't, we as truly (according to the Eſtabliſh't Church) wear the Livery of Chriſt as by being Baptiz'd*; a Calumny without ground or pretence. In Baptiſm our Church according to the Scriptures teaches us that we *put on Chriſt*; that is, lay aſide our Sins and Luſts, and become Partakers of the *Divine Nature*, 1 *Pet.* 14. whereby we are Priviledged as Sons of God, this is the true Badge and Diſtinction of Chriſtians, but our Church never ſaid any ſuch thing of the Croſs, and therefore to ſay that we Teach that we as *Truly wear the Livery of Chriſt by being Croſs't*, as by Baptiſm; or that the *Croſs is as effectually made, the common Symbol, or Teſſera of our Diſciplеſhip, as Baptiſm*, are moſt grievous Calumnies. *I* beſeech God to pardon thoſe that endeavour to keep up a Party againſt us by ſuch Accuſations, and to turn their Hearts.

II. But then, 8thly, a Sign may be called *Diſtinguiſhing* becauſe we thereby declare, teſtify and profeſs to the World that we claim and own the Priviledges and Characters that God has been pleaſed to beſtow on us as Chriſtians, and thus indeed the ſign of the Croſs is a Badge and Token of our Chriſtianity. But then this is no proper or peculiar, much leſs principal uſe of the Sacraments; our keeping the Lords Day, our appearing in a Chriſtian Aſſembly, our Kneeling, uncovering our Head, our Faſting on publick occaſions, our Standing at our Confeſſion of Faith are all of them Badges, and Tokens in this ſenſe of our being

Chriſtians

Chriſtians, as well as the ſign of the Croſs; and are all of them warranted by the Scripture; the ſame may be ſaid, as I have already ſhewed, of our Chriſtian Names, and of many other Signs uſed among us and precedented in Scripture.

Particularly, That of your giving Tickets to thoſe that are to Communicate, concerning which I ſhewed you (*Admon. p.* 37.) that it was an Outward and Viſible Sign; and Secondly, That it ſignified your Right and Claim to the Lords Supper and Communion of Saints, which is a Spiritual Grace or Priviledge. Thirdly, That it was a Badge and Token, whereby Priviledged Members were diſtinguiſhed: And Fourthly, a ſort of neceſſary Term of Communion.

To this Mr. *B.* Replies (*Vind. p.* 53.) 1. That, *A Ticket with you is a Sign of nothing more, than that the Perſon that brought it, was allowed to Communicate at that time*; To which I Anſwer, That to be allowed to Communicate at any time is a great Grace, and Privilege; and therefore, this Ticket is plainly a Badge of a Mans Aptitude, Priviledge, and Title to the Memberſhip of Chriſt; and a Declaration from the Miniſter who gave it to him, that he thinks him entitl'd to it at that time; and to declare who is fit and unfit, who ſhall be admitted or not admitted, is a Spiritual Act, and belongs to the Power of the Keys; and this is a clear Proof, that we may ſignifie our ſenſe of Spiritual Things, even in particular Duties, by Signs as well as Words when they are proper.

Secondly, He Objects that this is no Badge; becauſe, many may be *Members that have no Tickets at preſent, becauſe they do not at preſent Receive*; but even to diſtinguiſh Perſons at preſent fit to Receive from others that are not, is to make it a Badge in a very weighty Matter.

Thirdly, He Argues, That a Mans having a Ticket wou'd not ſecure his *Admiſſion, if he were not known to be a Member of that, or ſome other Congregation.* This indeed ſhews, That it is no infallible Mark; a Man may ſteal this Badge, or come diſhoneſtly by it, and when that is diſcovered, he ſhall be Secluded; but in the mean time it is a Badge, that gains a Man Admittance without any Queſtion, if it be not diſcover'd to be Counterfeit; it is therefore a Livery of Chriſt's priviledged Members at that time; tho' if it be known, that any has ſtolen this Livery, he ſhall not be Owned or Admitted to Chriſts Table by it; it cannot therefore be denied, but it is a ſort of Wedding Garment.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, He Argues, That it is no neceſſary term of Communion, ſince no Man that is *a Noted Member of that, or any other Congregation ſhall be refuſed, tho' he have no Ticket*; but many are not *Noted* Members, and it is a neceſſary term of Communion to them. but ſuppoſe a man Refuſed and Condemned it as an *humane Invention*, and *humane Sacrament*, and all thoſe that uſed it as Idolaters, and Superſtitious, and wou'd ſet up another Communion if you did not lay it aſide, wou'd you diſuſe it to gratify ſuch a man? this is realy the caſe between you and us; I leave you to judge what you wou'd think of ſuch an unreaſonable perſon.

But 5ly Mr. *B.* alledges (vind. p 45) in ſuch multitudes as Receive, this or ſome ſuch expedient is neceſſary *to diſtinguiſh Communicants from meer ſpectatours*; to which I anſwer, that then ſome other badges and diſtinguiſhing ſigns may be neceſſary beſides the Sacraments, and therefore it is no uſe peculiar or proper to them to be badges or ſigns of our profeſſion, and the *relations we thereby are inveſted in*, as he contends; for ſure to be admitted as Communicants, is a relation wherein we are inveſted by our profeſſion; yet you ſee we may invent a ſign to diſtinguiſh this relation and thoſe that have a Title to it.

But *I* muſt put you in mind that there is no neceſſity for this *adge*; except what is criminal, and of your own making; if every Miniſter would adminiſter the holy Sacrament frequently in his own Congregation (as he ought to do) there needed none of theſe Multitudes or Croudings that are at your Sacraments, to which People come 30 or 40 Miles, as the Papiſts go on Pilgrimages at certain times to their Jubilees, or celebrated Saints, and which are the occaſion (as it generally happens in ſuch Crouds) of looſneſs and intemperance, and a great hinderance to Devotion, by crouding ſuch Families as live near the place where the Celebration is, whereby both the Guests and Families are hindred from that Quiet and Retirement, which ſeem very neceſſary to True Devotion at ſuch times.

Laſtly, he objects, that this can be no badge, or like to the Croſs, *except this perilous ticket had a Croſs on it, or the perſons that brought it were ordered to wear it on their Breſt or Forehead, as a Sign whereby they publickly profeſs their remembrance of and renewed dedication of themſelves to the ſervice of Chriſt their Saviour, as the adult members of his Church*, vind. p. 54. I cannot believe Mr. *B.* means here, that the adult members of our Church are ordered to wear Croſſes on their breaſts

or fore-head, to profeſs their Remembrance of, and Renewed Dedication to the Service of Chriſt, there being no ſuch Order, or Practice amongſt us.

But when all is done, I ſee no great difference between bringing a Ticket in my hand to profeſs, that I intend, and have a Title, to participate of the Body, and Blood of a Crucified Saviour; which is your uſe of a Ticket; and carrying a Croſs on my Forehead (if there were any ſuch Cuſtom or Order) to profeſs and ſhew, that I am not aſhamed of him, and intend to perſevere in his Service: Nor do I ſee, that a King who carries it in his Banner, when he Fights for the Preſervation of his Religion and Subjects againſt Infidels, makes it a *Sacrament*, more than you do your Ticket, which is another Name for a *Badge*.

To conclude this Point, it is very obſervable in what manner Mr. *B.* treats it, and me, in effect, for producing it. *'Tis I confeſs* (ſays he) *a very dangerous Ceremony, in which he has found out abundance of very Strange and Myſterious Significations* —— *If all theſe wonderful Spiritual Significations Aſſigned to this Poor Ticket*, &c. p. 53. *and* p. 54. *If indeed this Perilous Ticket had had a Croſs upon it*, &c. By theſe and ſeveral other Scoffing Expreſſions, he endeavours to expoſe the mention of this thing, and my Argument from it for the Uſe of the Croſs, as matters too ſlight and inconſiderable to be Offered, or to have any words made about them; and yet doth not conſider how momentous he thinks it, to make ſo many Words about the Sign of the Croſs, which in it ſelf, and in our Uſe and Application of it, is not of greater Moment, or ſo like a Sacrament as your Ticket; this ſeems to me a very great inſtance of the power of Partiality and Prejudice; for the *wonderful Spiritual Significations* (as Mr. *B.* is pleaſed to call them) Aſſigned by me to your Ticket, are in effect no more, than upon Examination he owns to belong to it, and pleads to be neceſſary for *the Decent and Orderly Celebration of the* Lords Supper, and therefore are more Juſtly Aſſigned to it by me than thoſe, which he Aſſigns to our uſe of the Croſs. And there is this difference, that we diſown thoſe Significations which he would Affix to to the Croſs, whereas he cannot deny thoſe that I Aſſign to your uſe of a Ticket, as I have already ſhew'd.

And this gives me occaſion to put you in mind of a Book Printed 1607. written by one *Parker*, with great Seriouſneſs, and a great ſhew of Learning, with ſeveral thouſand Quotations; and in it, he charges the Croſs with the breach of all the Commandments, and has Chapters under theſe ſeveral Titles; *the Murther of the Croſs*, *the Adultery of the Croſs*, *the*

wrong

wrong of the Croſs, the Slander of the Croſs, the Concupiſcence of the Croſs. I think every one of them is as well founded as Mr. *B*'s charge of its being a *humane Sacrament*, and I doubt not, but when Faction is a little cooled, and Men allow themſelves to think, it will appear full as unreaſonable as Mr. *Parker*'s charges do to all impartial Men.

And were Men ſo diſpoſed, they might make as great a ſtir about this Ticket, and pretend as Juſt Cauſe for a Schiſm from you, on account of it, as you do from us, on account of the Sign of the Croſs; for a very little thing has always ſerved Factious Men for an opportunity of diſturbing the Peace of the Church.

Upon the whole, I think it fully appears, that both Scripture and your own Practice warrant us to uſe other Signs, which are not Sacraments, for the uſes aſcribed to Sacraments by Mr. *B.* ſo far as the Sign of the Croſs is concern'd in thoſe uſes, and I hope, that what I have ſaid concerning *Repreſenting*, *Obliging*, *and Diſtinguiſhing* Signs may help to give you a clear Notion of the true uſes of Sacraments, which Mr. *B.* has rather Obſcured than Explained, by expreſſing them in ſuch Words as are no way proper or clear, but of a very uncertain and ambiguous Signification.

SECT. VII.

Concerning the Croſſes being Warranted by Scripture.

I. HAving thus Juſtified the Uſe of the Croſs from Mr. *B*'s charge of being a *humane Sacrament*, I ſhall now conſider what he hath ſaid againſt its being Warranted by Scripture. I ſhewed in my *Admonition*, That

1ſt. We are Obliged to expreſs the inward Reverence and ſenſe of our Minds concerning God, by ſome outward Means.

2dly, That the Scriptures Command us to expreſs thoſe inward Thoughts and ſenſe of our Minds, by Actions as well as Words, where it may properly be done.

3dly, That the Scriptures teach us to expreſs our Thoughts and Senſe concerning Religious matters in ſuch Words, and Actions, as on other ſerious Occaſions ſerve to expreſs the like Senſe and Diſpoſition of our Minds.

4thly, That

4thly, That Glorying in the Sufferings of Chriſt, and profeſſing our ſelves ready to follow him, even to the moſt ignominious Death on the Croſs, is a Duty incumbent on us by Scripture.

5thly, That it is very proper at Baptiſm to make this Profeſſion.

6thly, That we are not only Warranted to do it by Words, but likewiſe by Actions.

7thly, That making the Sign of the Croſs, is an Action which Univerſal Cuſtom in all Ages and Churches ſince the Apoſtles time has applyed to this purpoſe.

Theſe I proved by Scripture and Reaſon, and he that wou'd Confute me, muſt prove it unlawful to expreſs the particular Duties we undertake in the Sacraments, by Actions that are by general Cuſtom expreſſive of theſe Duties.

II. To all theſe Mr. *B.* makes ſeveral Replies, which I ſhall conſider, and proceed further to confirm them, *Vind. p.* 40. 1ſt. He Argues, *This doth not reach the main Uſes of the Croſs which I was concerned to Defend*, That is, its being a *Dedicating* and *Diſtinguiſhing Badge*; for this, ſays he, pretends to prove *no more, than that it is an inſtructive Sign, to ſignifie or expreſs this particular Duty of Glorying in the Sufferings of Chriſt.*

I have obſerved that when Mr. *B.* is to anſwer an Argument of Force, he often puts it off with an unſcriptural hard word or a jeſt. Thus when I ſhewed the reaſonableneſs of directing all our Praiſes expreſsly to the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghoſt, whom we equally are obliged to Gloriſy, he turns it off with a jeſt, *Rem. p.* 26. *calling it a wonderful knack of turning the Pſalms of* David *into Chriſtian Hymns*, And yet it doth ſo effectually anſwer that end, that no Jew or Socinian will joyn in them when ſo uſed. So when I urged a plain and literal proof of Scripture, to ſhew that the People may joyn their Voices in the publick Prayers of the Church, as plain as any is for their joyning in ſinging Pſalms, *Acts* 4. 24, *they lift up their Voice with one accord and ſaid, &c.* This he tells us, *Rem. p.* 50. *proves no more than a conſent of their Minds*, contrary to the Letter of Scripture which aſſures us, that they *lift up their Voices and ſaid*, as well as conſented in their minds. Yet he offers only a Scoff for his contradicting Scripture, alledging *Rem. p.* 51. that it *brings in a confus'd Noiſe in a Chriſtian Aſſembly, too like a Dover Court, where 'tis ſaid all ſpeak and none hear.* The like might be ſhewed of his uſe of diſficult unſcriptural expreſſions. Thus when I prov'd beyond contradiction that only bowing the Body or ſuch like geſtures are called Worſhip in Scripture, he puts it off by telling us that theſe Devout poſtures are *more properly an Adjunct* of Worſhip, than a part of it; and that

thy

they are not a diſtinct Duty from Prayer and Praiſes, &c. *Rem. p.* 100 directly contrary to Scripture that enjoyns them ſeverally. Thus to prove the Croſs unlawful in Baptiſm, he tells us, *Rem. p. 6.* that it is *a ſtated Appendage* of a part of Divine Worſhip, and all ſuch Rites are unlawful; which are very fit Words to amuſe Ignorant People, but of no uſe to determine the Controverſie. And I take this before us to be of the ſame nature; for it is not eaſie to underſtand what is meant by an *Inſtructive Sign.* Signs as well as Words are deſigned to expreſs the Thoughts, the Intentions, the Diſpoſitions and Paſſions of our minds; and when we Kneel: For Example, at our Prayers, it doth not only Inſtruct and Teach us that it is our Duty to ſubmit to God, but it declares that we actually do it, and our Reſolution to continue in it, and is a motive and means to humble our own minds, and invite others to do the like; and ſo it is an *Obliging, Diſtinguiſhing,* and *Moving* Sign as well as an *Inſtructive.* The like may be ſaid of our Standing at the Profeſſion of our Faith, which doth not only Inſtruct us in our Duty that we are to believe thoſe Articles, but likewiſe declares that we do actually conſent to them, and oblige our ſelves to continue in them, and wou'd have all others to do the like; and ſo is not only an Inſtructing Sign, but likewiſe a Diſtinguiſhing, Profeſſing, Dedicating, and Moving Sign: for it Anſwers plainly all theſe purpoſes, and yet is commended by Mr. *Baxter* in his Infant Baptiſm, *Chap. 6. Obj.* 1ſt. The like may be ſaid of the Croſs: It doth not only inſtruct us, that it is our Duty to confeſs Chriſt Crucified and to become his Servants, but it ſignifies that we actually do ſo, and conſequently ſignifies our obliging our ſelves to it; and diſtinguiſheth thoſe that do it; all which my Arguments plainly reach.

III. But 2dly, Mr. *B.* Objects, *Vind. p.* 50. That he cannot *Grant that the Scriptures warrant our expreſſing the ſenſe of our Minds in all Religious things, or Matters by ſignificant Actions*; Becauſe, the *particular Duties we owe to God are almoſt Numberleſs*; Neither do the Scriptures *warrant us to contrive diſtinct Significant Actions, to expreſs each diſtinct part of our inward Worſhip.*

To this I anſwer, 1ſt. That I expreſly declared (*Admon. p.* 68.) that we are not to invent new Words or Actions, to ſignifie our Submiſſion and Thankfulneſs to God, but are to uſe ſuch as the general cuſtom of our Country has made ſignificant in the like Caſes: and therefore, if any diſtinct parts of our Duty to God have no particular Actions to expreſs them made ſignificant by General Cuſtom, we need not to invent new ones, but content our ſelves with Words, or the Application of ſuch general ſignificant Actions as may infer the particular Duty we are about to expreſs.

2dly, The general Heads of our Duty are few, and moſt of them have ſuch Grave and Solemn Actions appropriated to them, as not only inſtruct us in the Nature of them, but likewiſe move and influence our Minds to perform them with Seriouſneſs, engage us to that performance, and diſtinguiſh the Serious from the Negligent and Irreverent. And that it is lawful, not only to uſe ſuch to expreſs inward Worſhip in General, but likewiſe the particular Duties of it, I have ſufficiently proved in my *Admonition p.* 68, 69, 70. tho' Mr. *B.* alledges the contrary without Anſwering my Arguments; and I ſhall now further enforce them.

1ſt. Expreſſing our ſubmiſſion and Subjection to God is a particular Duty, and this is expreſſed by Kneeling, which by univerſal cuſtom ſignifies it; for we Kneel only to our Superiors, and to thoſe to whom we owe Submiſſion: Kneeling doth not ſignifie Reverence, or Humility in General, but that particular Reverence and Humility that is accompanied with Subjection.

2dly, To profeſs our Faith and Acknowledgments to God, is a particular Duty, therefore at our Confeſſion of Faith and Praiſes we ſtand; for ſtanding at the Reading and Declaring any thing doth peculiarly ſignifie an Aſſent to it; and therefore it was preſcribed at your taking your Covenant.

3dly, Subſcribing and Sealing a thing, is by Univerſal Cuſtom a Sign of *Ratifying* and *Confirming* what is ſo Sealed, and of our *Binding* our ſelves by it; therefore as I have already ſhewed, the *Jews* after the Captivity Writ and Sealed their Covenant with God.

4thly, Deep ſorrow and contrition for Sin is a particular Duty, and this we find in Scripture ſignified by Rending the Garments and Beating the Body.

5thly, Acknowledgment of our own Vileneſs, Corruption, and Unworthineſs is a particular Duty, and this we find in Scripture ſignified, *Neh.* 9. 1. *With Faſting, with Sackcloath, and Earth upon them*; theſe did not expreſs inward Worſhip in General, nor were they meer *bodily Geſtures*, as Mr. *B.* alledges, but were Signs of particular Duties.

6thly, Rejoycing in the great Deliverances and Mercies vouchſafed us by God, is a particular Religious Duty; and this we find ſignified by Singing, Feaſting, Dancing, ſending Portions to Friends, and White-Garments; which do not ſignifie meerly inward Worſhip in General, nor are they bodily Geſtures only; but *Affecting*, *Moving*, and *Diſtinguiſhing* Signs.

7thly, Co[n]

7thly, Condeſcention to ſerve one another in the meaneſt Offices of Charity, is a particular Duty; and this our Saviour ſignified to us by *waſhing his Diſciples Feet*; which was not only an inſtance of our Saviours Humility, as Mr. *B.* alledges, but a Sign to Teach and Move his Diſciples to do the like.

8thly, To lay aſide all hatred and malice, and to be in perfect Charity with one another, when we come to the Holy Sacrament, is a particular Duty; and this is ſignified by a *Holy Kiſs* in Scripture, as I have already ſhewed; the ſame is true of the Feaſt of Charity tho' Mr. *B.* excepts againſt it as well as againſt the kiſs of Charity, alledging that it is no *religious rite at all* but rather a *real Expreſſion of their mutual Charity*; Vind. p. 5. 2. but *I* anſwer that its being performed publickly in the Congregation and in the midſt of divine offices ſufficiently ſhews that it was Religious; and its being a real expreſſion of Charity is ſo far from hindering it from being a Sign, that it proves it to be one; there is no ſurer Sign of Charity then real Expreſſions and inſtances of it; effects are the ſureſt Signs of cauſes; If we ſhould appoint ſuch a Feaſt now to be celebrated in Church with the Sacrament, none wou'd doubt its being a *Religious rite*, and perhaps ſome wou'd call it an *Impoſition*.

9thly, To be buryed to Sin is a particular priviledge of Baptiſm, and infers, a Duty, which was ſignified by dipping under Water; to this Mr. *B.* anſwers firſt that *it is not certain the Apoſtles words* Rom. 6. 4. *referr to the dipping under Water*; but to this I reply, it is certain that generally the Primitive Chriſtians uſed this way, tho' in particular caſes they diſpenſed with it, as we do with the uſe of the Croſs; ſecondly it is certain the beſt Interpreters do thus underſtand this place, with which concurr your Aſſemblys Notes, who tell us that in *this Phraſe the Apoſtles ſeems to allude to the Ancient manner of Baptiſm, which was to dip the Parties Baptized, and as it were to bury them under the Water for a while and then to draw them out and lift them up, to repreſent the Burial of the Old-Man and our Reſurrection to newneſs of Life*; nor is there any other Juſt reaſon of the Phraſe to be given, and therefore Mr. *B's* doubt concerning the certainty of it without any reaſon (for he gives none for his doubting) is in all probability to be attributed to his prejudice: for if this be true, it intirely ruins his notion of humane Sacraments; ſince here is a *Repreſenting*, *Obliging*, and *Diſtinguiſhing* Sign added to Baptiſm; which is all the Exception he has againſt the Croſs.

But ſecondly he alledges that I ought to prove, that *the Chriſtians of that Age had Arbitrarily and without warrant from Chriſt or his Apoſtles ſet it up*; but I think it ſufficient for me to ſhew that it was ſet up, and that it is a rite diſtinct from Baptiſm; both which are apparent; it is incumbent on Mr. *B.* to ſhew where Chriſt or his Apoſtles inſtituted it. 'Tis manifeſt that it is not in the firſt inſtitution by our Saviour for that requires only waſhing with Water, which may be performed either by dipping or pouring on water; This then is a *Rite* Superadded to Baptiſm of a *repreſenting* and *obliging* nature, and ſo interpreted by St, *Paul* himſelf: therefore all ſuch rites are not *Sacraments*, or unlawful: It is manifeſt St. *Paul* approved the Rite, but there is no evidence of its Divine Inſtitution; and therefore the Church has made no ſcruple to lay it aſide, and that without any abſolute neceſſity; for the warming Water for Baptiſm uſed in ſome Places to this day, might prevent the inconveniency of a cold Country; which is all Mr. B. alledges for diſuſing it; *Vind. p.* 52. but cou'd not excuſe us, if this were part of the *inſtitution.*

Thirdly, To change our condition in Baptiſm, from the power of Sin to Holineſs, from Sons of Wrath to Sons of God, is a ſpecial Privilege; and to live accordingly, a *Duty*. Now, this was ſignified by the change of Cloaths, when Perſons were Baptiſed; and to this, as *I* ſhewed in my Admonition, the Apoſtle alludes, *Gal.* 3. 27. *For as many of you as have been Baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt*; to this Mr. B. Anſwers as to the former, that it is not certain, the Apoſtle alludes to this Cuſtom; but here again, *I* have the beſt interpreters thus Expounding it; *I* have the Practice of the Church of God uſing this Rite from the Apoſtles time, *I* have the neceſſity of the thing to prove it was done in their time, for Dipping in Water cou'd not be without putting off, or change of Cloaths, and there is no other Reaſon given of the Phraſe; and therefore Mr. B's Doubt without reaſon, is of no moment in ſuch a Caſe; he may juſtly be ſuſpected to doubt out of Prejudice that muſt loſe his Cauſe, if the thing prove true that he doubts of.

But 2*dly*, he argues, that if *the Apoſtles expreſſion referrs to theſe two rites as uſed to theſe purpoſes, it will be more reaſonable to conclude that they are part of the ordinance of Baptiſm and conſequently to be ſtill retained and uſed by us*, Vind. p. 52. I think it much more reaſonable to ſuppoſe that Mr. B. is miſtaken in his account of *Sacraments*, then to ſuppoſe either of theſe rites were part of the ordinance

of

of Baptiſm, or that we are obliged to retain or uſe them; we have the ordinance delivered to us twice in Scripture, and neither of theſe rites are mentioned in it, and therefore they are no part of it; They were certainly uſed in Baptiſm in the Apoſtles time, and to thoſe purpoſes I have mentioned; and the Conſequence is that Mr. B's. charge is groundleſs that wou'd make ſuch rites *humane Sacraments* and unlawful; and approches near to the Doctrine that makes that unlawful which God has not made ſo, 1. *Tim.* 4. 1, 2, 3.

11thly, To reject a perſon from the means of Grace is a religious Act, and belongs to the power of the Keys; Now the Scriptures warrant us to do this, by ſhaking off the duſt of our feet, which doth not ſignify our duty in general, but in particular, our deteſtation and abhorrence of the Obſtinacy of the perſons, againſt whom we uſe it, or rather indeed, Gods rejecting them; and it no more makes Confirmation a Sacrament, becauſe in it we aſſure the Perſons Confirmed of Gods favour by laying on of hands, than it made ſhaking off the duſt from the feet a Sacrament, becauſe it was uſed to aſſure the perſons againſt whom it was done of Gods rejecting them from his grace, and the like may be ſaid of the Sign of the Croſs.

12thly, To receive a penitent member into the Society of a Church is a particular and Religious Duty; Now this the Church of *Scotland* Orders to be done not only by words, but Signs alſo; So in the firſt book of Diſcipline in the order for publick offenders, *The Miniſter ought to exhort the Kirk to receive the penitent brother in their favours—— and in Sign of their Conſent, the elders and chief men in the Kirk ſhall take the penitent by the hand, and one or two in the name of the reſt ſhall kiſs and embrace him with reverence and gravity, as a member of Chriſt Jeſus*: From which it appears that this Church (for which I ſuppoſe you have a value) thinks that it is lawful to expreſs our thoughts about religious things by Signs as well as Words; And I do not ſee but taking by the hand, kiſſing and embracing a Man in token that he is admitted as a reconciled member of Jeſus Chriſt, is every whit as much a Sacrament as Signing him with the Sign of the Croſs, in token that he ſhall not be aſhamed to confeſs Chriſt Crucified.

13thly, To confeſs and acknowledge our Scandalous Sins to God and his Church, is a particular Religious Duty and a part of worſhip; Now the Church of *Scotland* in the form of Excommunication in *Knox*'s Liturgy, orders a murtherer to confeſs his Crime thus, *He ſhall ſtand three ſeveral Sundays in a place before the Church door, bare footed and*

bare Headed, cloathed in baſe and abjected Apparel, having the ſame Weapon which he uſed in the Murther, or the like, bloody in his Hand, and in conceived Words ſhall ſay, &c. Undoubtedly, they that Ordered this, made no Queſtion, but we might expreſs the ſenſe of our Minds in Religious Matters, by Signs as well as Word. Theſe were not to expreſs inward Worſhip in general, nor are they meer bodily Geſtures, but ſymbolick Signs and Badges of Repentance. Mr. *B.* may think himſelf unconcerned in theſe two laſt inſtances, but I believe you will not.

IV. His third Objection againſt my Proof of Scriptures Warranting the uſe of the Sign of the Croſs is, That *the ſame Argument will ſerve as well to Juſtifie many other Rites which the Romiſh Church has added to Baptiſm, and the other parts of Gods Worſhip*; Vind. p. 48. Now to this I Anſwer,

1ſt. That it was incumbent on Mr. *B.* in this Point (as I told you in my Admonition) to prove by Scripture, that it is unlawful to ſignifie, or expreſs the particular Duties we undertake in the Sacraments, by Actions that are by general cuſtom expreſſive of thoſe Duties, and to anſwer the Scriptures I produced; but he has not produced one ſingle inſtance from Scripture where ſuch Signs or expreſſions of a particular duty are condemned meerly becauſe they thus ſignified or expreſſed it: which I take to be a plain Confeſſion that he wants direct proofs; and till he produce ſome ſuch Scripture proof he cannot acquit himſelf of teaching that to be unlawful which God has not made ſo, like [illegible] that forbad Meats and Marriage, 1. *Tim.* 4.

2dly, To condemn a thing for imagined conſequences without direct Proof, is a very uncertain, and (which is worſe) a very dangerous Method; for it lays a Snare in the way of the Weak; A Man that knows, that the Church of God has uſed the Sign of the Croſs ſince the Apoſtles time Univerſally; that the Church of *England* and *Ireland* approve of its, together with the Proteſtant Churches of *Sweden*, *Denmark*, and the Lutheran Churches of *Germany*, and ſees what can be ſaid for it, will not eaſily be perſwaded, that it is unlawful; and when he hears, Proteſtants affirm, that the many Rites which the Romiſh Church has added, may as well be Juſtified, and that the *firſt Reformers ſeem to be unreaſonable in rejecting them*, (as *Mr. B.* alledges, *Vind.* p. 49.) he will be apt to conclude, that there is no great harm in them; and I doubt not, but the imprudent drawing ſuch conſequences, has actually reconciled many to Popery, and ſome to Atheiſm; and therefore, a man that loves his Religion will be very ſparing of Drawing them; for he will conſider if he have direct or Scripture Proof for a thing, they are needleſs; and if he have no direct

or Scripture Proof for his Tenent, he has Reaſon to ſuſpect the Truth of it: For I ſuppoſe, every ill thing is forbidden in Scripture, and may be Condemned from thence; as for the drawing conſequences, they may ſerve to render a Tenent Odious, but rarely ſerve to ſatisfie a reaſonable man without direct Proof.

3dly, The Advocates of the Church of *Rome* are deeply concerned to defend their own Worſhip, and have produced all the Arguments they could againſt us; and yet I think, I may ſay, have failed in them all; and I do not believe *Mr. B.* will pretend to manage them better than they have done; tho' this be not the firſt time he has lent them his Aſſiſtance with what deſign I will not judge: But this conſideration alone were ſufficient to excuſe me from anſwering this Argument.

Yet, leſt it ſhou'd really have that influence on weak minds that ſuch arguments ſometimes have in the mouths of pretended Friends or profeſſed Enemies, to make them have a better Opinion of the Roman Rites than they deſerve, I will endeavour to give you a true account of this matter that you may ſee what Rites we condemn in the Romiſh Church. I think this due to the juſtification of our Reformers, reflected on by Mr. *B.* as unreaſonable.

1ſt. Then we condemn ſuch Rites and Ceremonies, as ſignify any peculiar preſence or power of God to be in any place or thing where he has not promiſed it; becauſe it is not in the power of man to diſpoſe of Gods influence or preſence, or to tye them to any Action, thing, or place without his own Act; upon this account, the Heathen Images, Temples, and Altars were all unlawful; and ſo are thoſe of the Papiſts, if we take them as they paſs in the Eſtimation of the Vulgar.

2dly We condemn all repreſentations of any glorious being in order to worſhip it, as being againſt the Second Commandment expreſsly.

3dly, We reject all ſuch Signs as pretend to carry any ſupernatural efficacy or vertue with them; becauſe all ſuch efficacy and vertue muſt proceed from God, and we ought not to preſume that he will communicate them to Signs or Rites, except we have his promiſe for it; and on this account we judge the Popiſh Holy Water, Oyle, Spittle, Croſſing *&c.* to be ſuperſtitious.

4thly Such rites as by their number or quality engage the thoughts, and divert them from attention on Gods Service: ſuch are the many Croſſings (200 if I remember right in one Office) Bowings, Kneelings, Kiſſings, and frequent motions from one place to another in the Maſs.

5thly,

5thly, *Such* ſigns as are not eaſily underſtood, *dark and dumb Ceremonies*, as our church calls them; whoſe deſign and ſignification are not eaſily comprehended by the people: ſuch are the many Veſtments of the popiſh Prieſts, the furniture of their Altars, the lights, oyle and ſalt in their baptiſm, *&c.*

6thly, Such as neither preſent univerſall cuſtom or nature have made proper and ſignificant of the things they are deſigned to expreſs; or if formerly they have been ſignificant are now antiquated, having loſt their ſignification by time, as words do (the cuſtom that made them ſignificant being changed;) as it has happened to putting off the ſhoes at our coming into the houſe of God, covering the head, the Kiſs and Feaſts of Charity, the dipping in Baptiſm, and changing the Cloathing; the continuance of which we count Burthenſome and Superfluous.

7thly, Such as are not proper to influence Mens minds and engage them to perform the office they are about with more Seriouſneſs and attention, or as our Church expreſſes it, that are not apt *to ſtir up the dull minds of men by ſome notable Signification*; ſuch are many Geſtures of the Prieſts in the Maſs, and many other Ceremonies of the Roman Church.

8thly, *Such* as pretend to propitiate or reconcile us unto God; becauſe that can only be done by means of his own appointment; on this account we reject *Agnus Dei*, the Pilgrimages, Proceſſions, Whippings and Faſts of the Papiſts that are performed with Opinion of Merit.

9thly, Such as have been abuſed and perverted to ſuperſtitious uſes, and cannot be ſeperated from them; on this account chiefly we have laid aſide the common uſe of Croſſing; not but we believe it was piouſly and prudently uſed by the Primitive Chriſtians, as an inſtance, expreſſion and Badge of their profeſſion amongſt Heathens and Infidels; but it was ſo abuſed, and the opinion of Efficacy and virtue in it to drive away Devils and to produce other Spiritual effects, ſo rooted in the minds of men concerning it, that there was no probability of taking away the abuſe of it whilſt the thing remained; and beſides the common uſe of it doth now no more amongſt us ſignify our common Chriſtianity, but is become the peculiar badge of a Papiſt, and ſo has loſt its Primitive ſignification.

To conclude we condemn only theſe Rites of the *Roman* Church againſt which we have theſe exceptions, or the like, (as where they want Gravity or Decency) and we are able to Juſtify

our

our Exceptions by reaſon and Scripture; but we never condemn'd any Rite of that Church, as Mr. *B:* doth the ſign of the Croſs in Baptiſm, either firſt, becauſe it Repreſented to us our Duty, and Inſtructed us in it. Or,

2dly, Becauſe it ſignified our purpoſe, reſolution, or vows to ſerve God, that is our Obligation or Dedication to his Service. Or,

3dly, Becauſe it diſtinguiſhed Chriſtians from Heathens, Worſhipers from ſpectators, or the devout Worſhippers from the negligent.

Ou the contrary we think theſe to be proper, and allowed Scripture uſes of outward ſigns in Gods Worſhip; and it were a juſt exception againſt any of them, if they did not ſerve to ſome of theſe purpoſes. Mr. *B.* may call ſuch ſigns *fooliſh Inventions*, &c. as he ſeems to do, *Vind*, p. 51. and charge the Church of God for uſing them; but we ought to be modeſt in ſuch cenſures, and remember the danger of calling our Brother *fool*, as we are taught by our Saviour, *Matt.* 5. 22. we never uſed ſuch Objections againſt Popery, from our firſt Controvertiſts to this Day; and this alone may convince you that Mr. *B*'s. Principles are not the common Principles of Proteſtants. And it is a great diſſervice to our cauſe (which we have maintained, thanks be to God, with ſucceſs, without the aſſiſtance of Mr. *B.* his party or Principles) to tell the World that we uſed ſuch Arguments as theſe.

VI. Laſtly, he objects that *the multiplicity of theſe Rites (or in the Bp's language ſignificant actions) had almoſt eaten out the vitals of Religion, Vind.* p. 51. But I anſwer, 1ſt. that we do not plead for the *multiplicity* of them, but for ſuch as are decent, proper, and edifying, and which univerſal cuſtom has made ſignificant, not ſuch as *Mens fancies* can *invent*; to admit ſome of the firſt ſort in Religion, doth no more open a Door to our *Fancies*, than admitting ſuch Words as general cuſtom has made ſignificant to expreſs our deſires, gives us Liberty to invent new ones never heard of before, or to introduce the Artifices of Mens Wiſdom into our divine Diſcourſe; which have done as much miſchief as ſignificant Actions, and are expreſsly forbidden.

2dly, The ſignificant Actions our Church uſes are far from a multiplicity, they are indeed fewer then we find uſed in the New Teſtament, and if we have erred on either hand, which I hope we have not, it is not in the multiplicity, but rather in the fewneſs of them.

3dly, They are with us ſo far from eating out the bowels of Religion, that on the contrary, the little care Men have of uſing ſuch, has deſtroyed

the ſenſe of Religion in a great many, and induced them to make no diſtinction between Good and Evil, Sacred and Profane, in many caſes.

4thly, The multiplicity of words which are ſigns to the ear, are as apt to eat out the bowels of Religion, as the multiplicity of ſignificant Actions, and our Saviour gives us an expreſs caution againſt them, *Matt.* 6. 7. the like we have *Eccleſ.* 5 2. ſo that the whole Diſpute ſeems to me, to be between the *Eye* and the *Ear*, which ſhall be gratified; and exceſs in either, have had too much the ſame Effect. Too many viſible Signs are apt to eat out the heart of Religion, and make it degenerate into *Shew*; and too many words which are *audible Signs*, are apt to have the like effect, and make Religion degenerate into *Talk*. of both which, the Church of God has had equal Experience, and are both equaly to be avoided.

CONCLUSION.

THus I have examin'd all that Mr. *B.* has Objected againſt our Worſhip, from the inſtance of the *Sign of the Croſs*; and prov'd it to be no *Humane Invention*, but warranted by Scripture, according to the Rules laid down in my firſt Diſcourſe to you, for the determining *what are Humane Inventions in the Worſhip of God.*

Mr. *B.* Indeed wou'd perſwade you, that by thoſe Rules he has retorted upon me my own Arguments againſt your Worſhip; and alledges (Vind. p. 55.) *'Tis ſtrange, that (except that of Croſſing) I have not ſo much as endeavoured to vindicate any one practice of the Eſtabliſh't Church, from my own Arguments retorted on me.* But I Anſwer, firſt, that to retort Arguments is generally, only a ſhift of Diſputants when the Arguments pinch them, and they want fair and direct Anſwers, and ſeldom are either juſtly or convincingly apply'd: and therefore weigh little with ſuch as ſeek only Truth, and not the ſervice of a Party. And indeed Mr. *B's.* were of ſuch a nature that I durſt well truſt them with indifferent Readers, the meaning of them being only this; if the Diſſenters Worſhip be mixed with *Humane Inventions*, that of the Eſtabliſh't Church is guilty of the ſame fault, which is a method to blacken both, but to defend neither; and may help to open your Eyes, and let you ſee that the Arguments formerly brought by your Advocats againſt our Worſhip, are equaly concluſive againſt your own

in

in this point; and therefore you are as much obliged to Answer them as we are. And I desire you to observe that Mr. *B.* has no way Answered them on your part, but by flying to his *Rule of Humane Prudence*, which I do not find you do generally approve, and therefore even according to your own Opinion, he has not cleared you from the charge of *Humane Invention* which I brought against your Worship.

But 2dly, I have shew'd you plainly (in the 2d Chap. Sect. 2 N. 9. of th's 2d. Admonition) that he has perverted the sense of that Rule I laid down concerning things *Contain'd* in and *Warranted* by the Word of God; and on that perverted sense, he has founded all those retorted Arguments which he alledges, I did not Answer. But having explain'd that Rule in my 2d Edition, so as he can find no exception to it, it was a sufficient Answer to all his Arguments.

3dly, I knew that the sense of my Words, before I so explain'd them, cou'd not but be manifest to every indifferent, and understanding Reader; and therefore, while with Reason & Justice, I disown'd the sense he wou'd put upon my words in that Rule, I thought, and still think, that I needed not trouble you any farther with answering particularly the Arguments which he has Retorted on that perverted Sense. Mens thoughts are generally co-herent, tho' their words do not always seem to be so; hence it happens sometimes that they may be wrested, and in these Disputes, a Man who endeavours to make a shew of Reasoning, for his Party catches at some ambiguous or doubtful Expression of his Adversary, and by putting an ill sense on it, which he knows will not be owned, he fills a Book in shewing that the Arguments make against him who produceth them; and this is what Mr. *B.* calls Retortion, and is another Artifice of those that write for a Party to amuse the World, and which I take Mr. *B.* to have practised very much in all that he has yet written; but whilest a Man takes this course, there is nothing written with such accuracy, but he may make it contradict it self; Ev'n the holy Scriptures not excepted.

I therefore thought it sufficient for me to Answer your great and principal Objection, which is this, of our using the Sign of the Cross; since this is the most direct and strongest proof you pretend to bring of *Humane Invention* in our Worship. In it *Mr. B.* tells us that all *Dissenters agree*; that it doth *directly concern the charge of Humane Inventions*; and that here Dissenters used to *fix their charge*: To examine all your other Arguments, in which you do not agree as in this, were both endless and needless, for if this, where you used to fix your charge fail you, 'tis plain you are on an ill

Foundation. I have insisted on that objection, which is your strength against our Worship, and am sure, from what I have said, you have good Reason. 1st, To suspect *Mr. B.* surmises concerning me in other things, who supposes that I did not mention the Cross, because I cou'd not defend it. 2dly, To doubt the firmness of this ground, where *Mr. B.* says, you all fix your charge.

And now I must earnestly Admonish and Warn you to look into your own Hearts, and put it home to your Consciences, whether these pretences will bear you up at the last and great Day, when you shall be call'd to account for your neglect of the publick Worship of God, while you might have had opportunity of frequenting ours. And if upon enquiry you find Faction or Carnalness to be at the bottom, and *Idolatry* or *Humane Sacraments* to be only pretences (as I think they can be no more then pretences, to those that impartially Read these Papers) you may conclude they will sink at that Day from being pleas before the great searcher of Hearts, you and I must come to this Tryal, and 'twill then appear, whether I that have used my utmost endeavours to bring you to the publick Worship of God, or *Mr. B.* who scoss at my concern, and Zeal for that Worship and for your attendance at it, have approved our selves most to our great Master.

Mr. B. as I observed before, owns it Lawful for you to come to our ordinary Lords day Service when you have none else to go to, and he had acted both an Ingenuous and Christian part, had he endeavour'd as diligently and zealously to perswade you to do this, as he has been eager to put this stumbling block of the Cross in your way against our Worship, (at least from thence to confirm and encrease your prejudice against it) but as he has managed it, he has given ground to suspect that his zeal is answerable to his endeavours which are apparently much greater for his Party, then our common Christianity.

I intreat you therefore seriously to consider of these things, as of what you must one Day give an account. And to believe that I have not made all these words about the Sign of the Cross for it's own sake, but rather to remove, if possible, that principle out of your minds, by which you are obliged to look on all such *Signs* as unlawful; for this Principle duly pursued, must prove a stumbling block, and occasion of perpetual divisions to the end of the World, in all Societies of Men where it is embraced. I have endeavour'd to shew you, that it is a Principle unwarranted by Scripture; It is the spring and seed Plot, at least the pretence of our present

Divisions;

Diviſions; and is ſufficient, if allowed, to Juſtifie a Separation from any Church, that either is, or has been in the World, ſince there is not one Party of Men, that pretend tobe a Church, but have *Signs*, that are as much *Repreſenting, Obliging, and Diſtinguiſhing*, as we deſire to make the Sign of the Croſs. Even the Quakers keeping on their Hats, as a matter of Conſcience, and uſing *Thou* and *Thee* in Converſation, are to them as much *Inſtructive, Obliging, and Diſtinguiſhing Signs*, as the Croſs is to us; nor can it ſecure you to refrain from ſuch Signs as others uſe, for even, that Abſtinence, is alſo an *Inſtructive, Obliging, and Diſtinguiſhing Sign*; eſpecially, to ſuch as make it a matter of Conſcience; and ſo it is impoſſible to avoid uſing ſuch *Badges*. If therefore, people ſhou'd quarrel againſt all Signs on the ſame ſcore as *Mr. B.* does againſt the Sign of the Croſs; they may quarrel on to the end of the World, and there can never be any ſetled Union: And, unleſs ſuch Principles be removed from the Minds of well meaning People, 'twill be impoſſible to Unite them in any Eſtabliſhed Church or Order; or to hinder Diviſions from ſpringing up, if they were ſo United; ſince evil minded Men wou'd never want as plauſible Matter to amuſe and diſſettle them, as the Sign of the Croſs is pretended to be.

And I was the more willing to take ſome pains in this Affair; becauſe I have ſome hope, That what I have ſaid, may help to perſwade you to put a greater value on Sacraments, and to underſtand their Nature, Efficacy, and Neceſſity when they may be had, better then, I am afraid, many of you do.

I have no more to add, but to aſſure you, That what I write, is with a Deſign to do you Good, and to ſatisfie my own Mind in the Conſcientious diſcharge of my Duty and Office as a Paſtour amongſt you; I have endeavoured to do this, both by Words and Writing, and all other means in my Power. I ſhall by Gods help perſevere in them, and leave the Succeſs to Him I beſeech him of his great Mercy, to take away all Obſtinacy, Partiality, Error, and Prejudice from all Men; eſpecially, from thoſe under my Care; and to endow us all with a Spirit of Meekneſs, Charity, Patience, and Humility; That we may Love one another, and unite in the Praiſes and Worſhip of our common Lord and Saviour, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt; this is, and ever ſhall be the Prayer of

Londonderry
March 13.
1695.

Your Loving Paſtour,

Q WILL. DERRY.